THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*
A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY, 1925. Vol. XV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Other Side of Nicaea.

An historic service attended by a number of eminent prelates of the Eastern Orthodox Churches was held on St. Peter's Day at Westminster Abbey to commemorate the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicaea. The Primate's eloquent sermon struck the note of thanksgiving for the work of the Council of Nicaea, but it was a thanksgiving informed by knowledge and tempered by wisdom. 'Deeply,' said he, 'as we prize the time-proven words, what we stand by and live by is the truth which they embody for us in unshaken strength.' The Primate stressed the negative rather than the positive aspect of the Council's work:

> 'We think of it most readily as responsible for what we with substantial accuracy call the Nicene Creed, a formulary drawn up, like other creedal utterances, for the purpose of averting error rather than of defining truth, but used in the experience of the Church as a means of proclaiming the pivotal points of its teaching. As such we use it thankfully to-day. No one will aver or suppose that phraseology agreed upon in the fourth century will be exactly what theologians would compile in the twentieth; but, as has been well said by a Bishop of to-day, "the Church which formulated and accepted these phrases was perfectly aware of the difference between experience and the rationalized account of it; the experience was what mattered; and with a marvellous completeness the purely temporary forms of thought and speculation were excluded." What the creeds serve for is to keep steadily before men's eyes the articulated body of essential Christian doctrine: their use discourages undue concentration on any one point of doctrine or any one type of experience. They preserve the balance and proportion which are so apt to fail us, and to fail conspicuously the most eager and enthusiastic of us all. With that thought astir, to no year in the Church's story, after the Apostolic Age, can we look back more gratefully than to the year 325.'

It is probably a sound rule to be thankful for what we get and to make as good a use of it as we can. Pangloss taught his pupil Candide that everything happens for the best in the best of all possible worlds, and it is the fashion for the optimistic Churchman, in the spirit of Pangloss, to point out that the turning points in Church History have always been turns to the right. The Church's prophets have not been so sure of the truth of this interpretation of Church History.

It is usual to assert that the Council of Nicaea preserved the Christian doctrine of the Godhead from Polytheism on the one hand and from Pantheism on the other. Its great word *homoousios* (consubstantial), coined by a heretic, Paul of Samosata, and derived from Antioch, which would appear to have also given to the Church the equally notable words *Christian*, *Catholic*, and *Trinity*, protected the spiritual and moral supremacy of Jesus Christ, and enshrined in a single word the central conviction of the Christian Faith that the Divine Nature *sub specie humanitatis* is unveiled in Jesus Christ for the adoration and obedience of mankind. This undoubtedly had been the faith of the Church from the earliest times, but it was the Modernist Athanasius who won the Council of Nicaea to his way of presenting it as against the traditionalist presentation defended by Arius. The decision of the Council did not, unfortunately, bring that peace into the Church which was the main purpose of the Emperor Constantine in summoning it. It introduced instead an orgy of theological disputation which rent Christendom into parties and schisms for several hundreds of years, and gave an impression to the Church that ecclesiastical orthodoxy was of more importance than Christian morality. He, whose Person the members of the great Councils were so eagerly anxious to guard from wrong definition, had left on record the saying: 'Why call ye Me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?' Whilst the Church was engaged in Christological definition, the standard of Christian morality was experiencing a most grievous decline.

The Primate pointed out in his address that the Council of Nicaea 'gave sanction to the conviction that a free and numerous assembly was the best channel for arriving at Christian truth.' It may be very seriously doubted in the light of Church History whether such is the case. The promise, 'Where two or three are

gathered together in My name there am I in the midst of you,' does not prohibit the presence of the Divine Spirit in large assemblies, but it does not promise it to them. Democracy believes in the wisdom of large assemblies, although it was a notable French republican who said 'a great committee is a great evil'; but the Christian saints have been more disposed to weigh votes than to count them. The spring of Shiloah is able to revive the fainting soul in a degree which is denied to the turgid tide of the Euphrates. It was a bishop, a theologian, and a saint who, after attending at least one General Council and a number of lesser ones, remarked that the more he saw of them the less he liked them. If Church Councils are needful, and it is possible that they are, they should be viewed as a necessary evil and be attended with litanies and misgivings. Whether our Article XXI be right in asserting that 'General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes' some will question; but at least it has strong historical support for saying 'And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred in things pertaining unto God.'

The serious question with which we are faced is whether General Councils are necessary for defining the Christian Faith, and whether their efforts in that behalf have been either needful or profitable? The answer will depend in some measure upon what we mean by the Christian Faith. A theologian once asked a distinguished Professor of Economics and Sociology: What ought to be the faith of a re-united Christian Church, and whether it is needful or desirable to express it in the form of a creed? The professor replied:

> 'The only Faith in which it is necessary that the Church of Jesus Christ should be united is the Faith of Jesus Christ Himself, and that can be sufficiently collected from the Lord's Prayer. It is not necessary that that Faith should be expressed in the form of a Creed, since it is better expressed in the language of devotion than in the language of philosophy or history.'

Had the Christian Church taken that view it would not have assembled the Council of Nicaea and the subsequent General Councils, and had it adopted that policy it might have transmitted for the enlightenment of the Dark Ages, not a paganized Christianity, but a christianized Paganism.

Dr. L. P. Jacks discusses in the *Hibbert Journal* for July the theme of 'a creed in harmony with modern thought,' and concludes his article with these words:

> 'Might not harmony be more speedily attained if the question of a creed were dropped altogether and religion and science left to form unions *ad hoc* without the restrictions of treaty obligation? And may it not be that we are misconstruing the nature of religion when we represent it as contingent on harmony with modern thought?'

These are profound questions, and the present ruins of Nicaea —we refer to the locality, not the creed—and the rise and spread of Islam in the seventh century, suggest that it would have been better for the Church generally to have stressed right thinking in those spheres in which it plainly affected Christian practice, and to have ignored the speculations of thinkers in other spheres. Every philosophically-minded Christian is bound, in so far as he can, to get his Christian faith into harmony with his philosophical thought, but there is no need for the Church either to coerce or restrain him in this endeavour, nor is it necessary for the Church to strive to harmonize into a creed all these endeavours of her philosophically-minded members. She will do best by reminding them that the *lex credendi* is the *lex orandi*, and that the *lex orandi* must be the *lex operandi*.

The Ordination Problem.

The Report* just issued of the Archbishops' Committee on the supply of candidates for Holy Orders is a comprehensive and judicious document. It is pointed out that 2,850 fewer men have been ordained in the last ten years than in the period 1905-14. Of course statistics extending over this period are unreliable, for the period is abnormal. At the same time it is abundantly clear to those acquainted intimately with the situation that there is a serious shortage both in the quantity and quality of ordinands. By quality we do not mean moral and spiritual quality—it is almost impossible to assess that—but intellectual and social quality.

The Report deals with six causes for this falling off: (1) Indifference; (2) decay of religion in the home; (3) misconceptions with regard to clerical life and work; (4) the development of other openings for service; (5) intellectual difficulties; (6) financial difficulties.

* Published by the S.P.C.K. Price 1/- net. (1925.)

No. 14.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWSLETTER

JULY, 1925

THE LONDON ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual Business Meeting of the Churchmen's Union was held at the Church House, Westminster, on Tuesday afternoon, the 26th May, at three o'clock. Dr. Douglas White presided, and the minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, he announced that the following nine members had been elected to serve on the Council for a period of three years : Canon Durell, Dr. Macan, Mr. Claud Mullins, Rev. E. St. G. Schomberg, Mr. Nowell Smith, Rev. A. F. Robson, Canon Tollinton, Rev. H. J. Trueman and Miss Hilda Hubbard.

The Chairman then called upon Canon Glazebrook to move the adoption of the Annual Report of the Council. Canon Glazebrook said that he wished to add two things : one was the great satisfaction of the Council in having persuaded the Dean of St. Paul's to become their President, an appointment which added a new kind of distinction which they all valued ; the other was their good fortune in securing the services of Dr. Douglas White as their Chairman, of whose unfailing courtesy and devotion they had had experience, and by whose wise guidance they looked forward to profit for a long period. The Union was beginning to count for more in the counsels of the Church than it used to do, and an increasing number of people looked to them for a line of action in the difficult problems as they presented themselves. Those who, at the request of the Council, had taken part in a protest against the Romeward movement within the Church, had found themselves welcomed by men of various schools of thought. They had not purchased toleration by making concessions, but had been able to take a full share in the common effort. The discussions between men of different views had revealed a fundamental unity such as could not have been expected a few years ago. He hoped the Union would feel that it ought not to be merely academic, but to make a practical contribution to the general life of the Church.

The Hon. Gilbert Coleridge seconded, and said that a great step had been taken when representatives of the Churchmen's Union joined with those of other bodies within the Church for the discussion of matters of moment. The unity that had been displayed was remarkable. There was no pressing of violent and extreme positions, and the moderation with which different views were expressed was conspicuous. The desire uppermost was to find a basis of agreement. There was another example of this in the tone of the Conference held at Oxford last year. In the days of Huxley and Tyndall there was a real breach between science and religion : at Oxford an honest attempt was made to find a basis of reconciliation between these departments of human thought. They could look back to that Conference with the greatest satisfaction. To have got together leading men of science to address a religious conference, and to show that they were in sympathy with it, was in itself a significant achievement.

Sir John Barran moved that the statement of accounts as set forth in the Report be received and adopted. The financial position of the Union, he was glad to say, was a sound one, and had been improved by no less than £400 : they had received an anonymous contribution of £200, and a further £200 had been saved out of the current account. On the other hand, the Council would have, in March 1926, to consider a new arrangement with regard to the Organizing Secretary Fund, as the temporary

provision which had been made for it expired on that date. The Rev. E. St. G. Schomberg seconded, and suggested that, as there was very little time for drawing up the accounts between the 31st March, the date on which they were closed, and the annual meeting, the financial year should coincide with the civil year, and end on the 31st December. The suggestion was favourably received, and the accounts unanimously passed.

Sir John Barran was re-elected Hon. Treasurer for the ensuing year, on the motion of the Dean of St. Paul's, which was seconded by Dr. Major; and Mr. Henry I. W. James was re-elected Hon. Auditor for the ensuing year, on the proposal of Mr. Given-Wilson, seconded by Mr. Sharp.

The Chairman took up the point which Mr. Schomberg had raised with reference to the financial year, and said that it was open to the Council if it thought fit to make the suggested change, and close the accounts on the 31st December. Canon Tollinton proposed that the matter be referred to the Council with power to act. Mr. Schomberg seconded; and after the Secretary had pointed out that some details in the constitution would have to be changed, the resolution was agreed to.

After an interval for tea, Canon Leslie Hunter, of Newcastle, introduced the subject of *The Occasional Offices* of the Prayer Book in a paper full of point and interest, which is published in the July number of the *Modern Churchman.*

Canon Glazebrook then read a paper on the *Revision of the Communion Service,* which was published in the June number of the *Modern Churchman.*

In the discussion which followed, Mr. Coleridge advocated the provision of a period of silence in the middle of the service. He thought that a short interval for private prayer would do more to unite a congregation than the regular prayers of the liturgy. Mr. Simms stressed the importance of the manner in which the services of the Church should be said by the priest. They should be spoken in an audible voice, otherwise there was no need for translating the liturgy into the vulgar tongue. It did not matter what was the language of the prayers if they were recited inaudibly. Before the meeting terminated, Dr. Major referred to the loss the Union had sustained in the death of Mr. F. C. Channing, who was one of its original members, had served for some time on the Council, and was one of their Vice-Presidents. He would be much missed at their gatherings, where he was a familiar and always welcome figure. Miss Hart also spoke in appreciation of Mr. Channing's work in the early days of the Union.

The proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

The Public Meeting, which was held at the Caxton Hall, Westminster, in the evening, was largely attended. The Dean of St. Paul's, who presided, referred, in his opening address, to the great importance of the Conference held at Oxford last summer on the relation between science and religion. Those who attended that Conference went away much encouraged, for they felt that the hostility between science and religion was on the way to be reconciled, and the Churchmen's Union would justify its existence if it did anything to help forward a reconciliation. The object of their meeting that evening was to define their position and justify their existence. They stood for the protection of those who were persecuted, and for the religion of the Spirit as opposed to the religion of external authority. It was their conviction that the religion of the Spirit, which was the religion of free enquiry and of experience, was the true Christianity; and they claimed freedom to follow the light wherever it might lead them. It was still over difficulties between religion and science that Christianity had to face some of its most serious problems. One heard people say that these problems no longer existed, but that was untrue. There

Dr. Major has been invited by the President and Fellows of Harvard University, U.S.A., to deliver the Noble Lectures for 1925-1926. The subject of the lectures will be *English Modernism,* and they will be published by the Harvard University Press. He has already received many invitations to preach in American churches, and to address bodies of clergy, during his visit.

Dr. Major preached at the Trinity ordination in Birmingham Cathedral. The *Church Times* censures the Bishop for inviting Dr. Major to be the preacher on that occasion, and Dr. Major for saying in the course of his sermon that important as were the functions of the ministry in the Christian body, they were not more priestly acts than those of a hospital nurse, if she were moved by the spirit of Christ. As against the *Church Times* the statement of Dr. Major appears to be a true and reasonable deduction from our Lord's teaching as recorded in Matthew xxv. 34-36.

We hear that the Conference, which will he held this year at Oxford from August 24th to 31st, is not being well supported. The arrangements in connection with it, and the successful carrying through of it, involve an immense amount of labour; and if the Conference fails to pay its way, as seems highly probable from the small number of acceptances received so far, it is very unlikely that it will justify its continuance. We hope that those who have not made up their minds will decide to attend the Conference and insure its success. The meetings will be held in the Debating Hall of the Union, and a more comfortable and quieter place could hardly have been chosen. The President and Standing Committee, who have kindly given this permission, also offer the privileges of temporary membership of the Union to men attending the Conference.

Professor Sir William Ashley has been appointed a Vice-President of the Churchmen's Union.

The *Papers in Modern Churchmanship,* edited by the Rev. C. F. Russell, have met with very fair success. Nearly four thousand copies have been sold; and the resulting net profit from this encouraging sale has been felt to justify the publication of another set of four.

EAST SUSSEX BRANCH.

(Hon. Sec. : G. H. Ormerod, Esq., 49 Chapel Park Road, St. Leonard's.)

A meeting of the East Sussex Branch was held on the 8th May, when an outspoken paper on *Modernism and the Man in the Street,* which aroused much interest, was read by Mr. L. J. Hodson, of Robertsbridge.

Mr. Hodson said that he put forward his ideas as a layman, who had but little time for the study of theology; but he felt there was a danger lest a society like the *Churchmen's Union* should degenerate into an intellectual coterie, and neglect to extend its influence among ordinary men and women, and so aim to make England a nation of Christians as well as a Christian nation.

By Modernism he meant, not a creed or school of belief, but an attitude of mind. Modernists were not confined to one school of thought in any of those matters in which diverse views are held, and in all likelihood will be held, by members of the Church of England, so long as it remains, in any true sense of the word, a National Church. The Modernist does, however, contend that a churchman should approach religion in a reasonable frame of mind. By ' The Man in the Street ' he meant a typical member of that large section of the population which for the most part is content with the rôle of onlooker. He had little use for institutional religion, and one might be disposed to draw the conclusion that his religious instincts were practically dead. This was, in Mr. Hodson's opinion, a far too pessimistic view. He believed that the ordinary man thinks a great deal more about religion than he is generally given credit for. However much a man might eschew all outward participation in public worship, and however much he might limit his thoughts to the material plane, he was bound at times to be

by every clergyman at his ordination were a temperate but unmistakable statement of Reformation theology.

The speaker referred to a recent book on Hooker by the Rev. L. S. Thornton, of Mirfield, in which it was argued that Hooker represented the revival of Catholicism in the Church of England, and the gradual abandonment of Protestantism. This could not be maintained. Hooker, like the later Anglo-Catholic divines, was a consistent champion of the Reformation. The Protestantism of the Anglo-Catholic divines of the seventeenth century was the key to English political history from the Restoration to the accession of the House of Hanover. Only lately had the Protestantism of the Church of England been disputed, but the facts could not be denied.

Yet the Church of England was not typically Protestant. It could not be called Lutheran or Calvinistic. Anglican theology had arisen through conflict not only with Rome but also with Geneva. It had challenged in the name of learning and of reason the moral and intellectual tyranny of Calvinism. Hooker agrees with Geneva in rejecting the Roman claim for ecclesiastical tradition as an authority co-ordinate with Scripture, but he dissents from Geneva in its attempt to base the whole of human life upon the authority of the written word. As Mr. Thornton well brings out, Hooker follows Aquinas in arguing that man's life was regulated by a hierarchy of laws, each valid in its own sphere, in which the supernatural law contained in Scripture was supreme. The position was now vastly changed. Europe was no longer divided into opposing Catholic and Protestant camps, from which the modern state, predominantly secular in character, had emerged. Rome refuses on principle to come to terms with the modern world. For a different reason, and in an entirely different spirit, the Free Churches are suspicious of connexion between Church and State, and thus indirectly encourage the secularisation of the State. The Church of England, acknowledging the Royal Supremacy both in Church and State, stands once more for a *via media*. It is her function to attempt to co-ordinate, in the Catholic spirit of Richard Hooker, the various modes of God's working in the world.

Mr. A. E. Lynam was the next speaker. He wished to say a few words from the layman's point of view. He considered that the Churchmen's Union would be greatly helped if an effort were made to get in touch with the moderate section of the Anglo-Catholic party. What was far more important than finding fault with other church parties, or those whom they regarded as opponents, was that they should direct their energies to influencing those who were outside the Church, and looked upon the Church as a venerable but effete institution. He felt that much might be done in adapting the services of the Church so as to bring them more into relation with modern religious needs; and he deplored the shortage of books dealing with religious subjects, which were not committed to a traditional view, or were at pains always to reach a correct and orthodox position. There was a great need for books which taught Christianity with the emphasis on Christ.

The Rev. A. E. N. Simms, Vicar of Greyshott, Surrey, who followed, put in a plea for the parochial clergy, who had to minister directly to the needs of the people and translate the great principles of the Christian religion into terms which they could understand. The doctrine of rewards and punishments was bankrupt; and when accepted positions of an earlier age became hopelessly discredited, there was danger lest religious teaching be mainly destructive. The parochial clergyman must be prepared with positive teaching, and that was a real difficulty when he is confronted with much religious teaching which was held without question fifty or sixty years ago, but is no longer accepted. What was the solution? The New Testament still stood as the incomparable source for getting at the religion of Christ.

were still very serious difficulties connected with the relations of religion and science, although on both sides there existed a much better spirit, greater mutual respect, and greater wish and hope that some solution could be found. The religion of Roman Catholics was essentially the swallowing undigested of somebody else's religion; the acceptance, for instance, of the authority of the Pope in matters of natural science against the authority of Darwin. They believed that there was no ready-made solution to their difficulties, and that they could not allow anyone to make a religion for them. There was no use in denying the fundamental cleavage between this unspiritual religion of authority, which in practice was bigoted and intolerant, and the religion of the Spirit, which was the religion of Paul and John, of Clement and Origen, and in which it was natural to find diversities of gifts and operations. From this truly Catholic Church no man could separate or excommunicate them: from it a man could only separate himself. They were not preaching any new thing, but perpetuating what had been the true teaching of the Church from New Testament times, and in that sign they would conquer.

The Chairman then called upon Dr. Major, the Principal of Ripon Hall, who said that he looked forward to the time when religious people would be able to discuss quite freely with historians the origins of Christianity. There was no more pressing question than the relation of history to religion, and they could not disguise the fact of the conflict between the historian and the traditional Christian. He regarded this as a testimony meeting, and therefore he could speak quite freely of his own religious experience. He was a modernist before he became a member of the Churchmen's Union. He had read science at a Colonial University before he came to Oxford to study theology. He was aware that those of the clergy who dared to think independently were passed over and ignored, but it did not occur to him to join any society till he came to know of the Churchmen's Union. He had always been against joining a party within the Church lest he might be guilty of an act of disloyalty to the Church. But he felt that he was surrounded by a conspiracy of silence. He consulted Dr. Rashdall, who was most emphatic on the value of an organisation like the Churchmen's Union, and urged him to join it, and to get others to join it. He became a member, and never regretted doing so. They could judge of the impression that the Modernist movement was making by the undisguised fear which was so prominent a feature of the *Church Times*, when Modernism, and what it stood for, came under comment or discussion.

He would like to say a few words on the progress that Modernism was making in the religious world. Of the chief theological books now appearing many were the work of modernists. A Modern Churchmen's Union had been founded in the Episcopal Church of America, which already numbered three hundred clergymen among its members, and also included a certain number of leading churchmen. Lastly, the work to which they were committed was not a matter of agitation, which was almost inevitably connected with a denomination, but was concerned with education. Education was slow but sure, and of special importance in the training of ordinands; only to be worthy of the name it must be conducted on truthful and comprehensive lines.

The Rev. J. M. Creed, Fellow and Dean of St. John's College, Cambridge, who followed, said that ecclesiastical controversy was in itself distasteful to all right-minded people, but an element of controversy was necessarily involved in the search for truth. He proposed to deal with a controversial topic—the applicability of the ajectives 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' to the Church of England. If the popular antithesis Catholic-Protestant was accepted, and if the terms were regarded as mutually exclusive, then the Church of England could not be said to be 'Catholic,' for it was undeniably 'Protestant.' The thirty-nine articles subscribed to

brought up against the problems of life and death. However careless a man might be about spiritual matters, he experienced from time to time the need of religion, and might make spasmodic efforts to learn more about it by going to church or chapel. But, and this was the point to which we should devote attention, he so seldom finds what he is in search of.

Such people were often more interested in religion than the class who compose the regular congregations; and it was deplorable that, when they made efforts to associate themselves with the work and worship of the Church, they found themselves in an atmosphere which produced a kind of spiritual lethargy, stifling all free enquiry. So far from the 'Man in the Street' being hostile to Modernism, nine out of ten of them were modernists, and found that neither of the two great parties of the Church wanted the man who wished his religion to have a rational and intellectual as well as an emotional basis. He had scant sympathy with the party which barred all discussion of matters on which the Church had defined its position by mediæval standards and methods, or with those who thought that all the problems of life might be solved by the literal application of texts from the English Bible.

HERTS BRANCH.

(Hon. Sec.: H. F. WALKER, ESQ., 29 Beaconsfield Road, St. Alban's.)

A meeting of the Herts Branch was held on the 15th May, by invitation of the Rev. W. Fairlie Clarke, Vicar of St. Andrews's, Watford. The Rev. H. J. Trueman presided, and an address was given by Dr. Douglas White, Chairman of the Council of the Churchmen's Union, who took as his subject *The Effect of Modern Knowledge on Christianity.*

In the course of his address, Dr. White said that thoughtful religious people of to-day were broadly divided into two camps. One camp—and it was the larger—considered that religious ideas and secular knowledge were in separate watertight compartments. The other and smaller camp denied this distinction and regarded human nature as all one. The former believed that the vast change of view brought about in the last century in astronomy, physics, biology and psychology need make no difference to their religious outlook. But the progress of these sciences had, in fact, not only modified but revolutionised our whole concept of the universe. The only way in which the watertight compartment theory could be maintained was to say that God exists outside of and independent of His universe, and that our ideas of the one need not vary with our ideas of the other. The newer view, however, was that, as a matter of history, the conceptions of God have changed with those of the universe. It is now perceived that the universe is a 'universe,' and not a 'multiverse'; that it is orderly and not chaotic; that it works on a regular system, having its laws, *i.e.* regular sequences, in physics, biology and psychology; and that even the personal relations of men with each other, and humanity with God, work along constant paths. Anglican Modernism stood for the frank and joyful acceptance of new truth from every quarter, knowing that it was bound to modify many preconceptions both about the Church and the Bible, but remaining firm in the faith of Christ's revelation of the Fatherhood of God, and that love was the secret of the universe. If they faced Truth unflinchingly and at all costs, they would find, as many could testify, that the religion with which they were left was deeper, simpler, and truer than the expression of it which they had had to abandon. Religion, like science, was bound to be progressive unless it was dead; and if our views of God and the universe were progressive, so also must be our views of man. The doctrine of the essential unity of man's nature meant that spirituality also was an essential part of his nature, and had grown to be so in the course of evolution.

All communications for the *Newsletter* should be sent to the Editor, the Rev. F. G. Given-Wilson, Dedham Vicarage, Colchester.

HOLYWELL PRESS, OXFORD.

Undoubtedly there is an increasing secularization of English life. The elimination of a belief in hell has made life a less serious affair than it was half a century ago. The demand for pleasure and the full enjoyment of life is voiced to-day by young people in a way that might astonish their parents if their parents had not ceased to be astonished by anything. What their parents viewed as a privilege to be earned, they claim as an indefeasible right. This is not necessarily immoral, but it complicates the situation, because there is not enough in our modern English world in the way of money, leisure, pleasure, and petrol to go round on the scale which young people demand, not only for themselves, but—and herein their unselfishness is manifest—for others. The life of a clergyman, although not regarded as a really hard life, is yet not attractive. If our Church authorities could promise that every curate should have his car, some might be attracted to the clerical life who are now indifferent. But would it be worth while? All are agreed it would not. Only those possessed of a certain moral vigour and a desire to be socially serviceable should be ordained; others are better employed as chauffeurs, and groundsmen, and cinema attendants in spheres where one's life's work and one's daily recreation are delightfully combined.

Intellectual difficulties are more serious. Many of the bishops are personally sympathetic to those who are troubled by them. Unfortunately their chaplains seem sometimes a good deal less sympathetic, and a certain number of the questions set for ordinands to answer in their diocesan examinations seem curiously inquisitorial and help to accentuate the intellectual *malaise*. It is injudicious at the present time for examining chaplains to stress 'the empty tomb,' and 'the Virgin Birth,' and the nature of the sacrifice in the Eucharist. It does not help ordinands to believe in them. Such a question as 'Explain carefully how far you regard extra-liturgical devotions to the Blessed Sacrament as permissible,' may help the examiner to discover to which church-party the ordinand belongs; but when the ordinand replies, 'I regard all such practices as sub-Christian,' as one recently did, he should not be reported to his bishop as lacking in liturgical knowledge.

Frankly, there is at present too much heckling of liberally-minded ordinands suspect of Modernist tendencies to make any

except very resolute men of this type face the ordeal of ordination. Also, it ought to be noted that many young men of intellectual and moral vigour are turned away from the thought of Orders at an earlier stage. It is less than three weeks ago that a young man reading for 'Greats' told us that, having consulted the chaplain of his college, he had been informed that his views were much too unorthodox to allow of his ordination. Certainly his 'views'—typical, no doubt, of hundreds of his fellow undergraduates—were not traditional. Nevertheless he seemed to us, with his moral and intellectual vigour and loyalty to Christ, the sort of man who in the right environment would prove a valuable Christian leader and teacher. There is a Grace of Orders, not perhaps bestowed by episcopal hands so much as by the experience of the ministerial life, which develops in the sincere and serviceable a fundamental orthodoxy which at least enables them to serve very usefully in the ministry of the English Church. Where there is a fundamental loyalty to Christ 'views' may be lightly regarded.

There is, it will be urged, the problem of subscription. This is really not so great as it seems. If it be openly stated by the Church authorities that the particular statements in Creeds and Articles may be liberally interpreted in the light of modern scientific and historic knowledge, their retention as formularies for subscription presents no real difficulties. The difficulties arise when this liberal interpretation is refused. For educated young men to-day the difficulties connected with the XXXIX Articles are no greater than those connected with the Creeds. We should deprecate any attempt to re-write historic documents, whether Articles or Creeds. Such a proceeding would involve us in greater difficulties than those in which we at present find ourselves. The proposal made by the Report to alter the question about the Scriptures put to Deacons at their Ordination is altogether commendable. The Report proposes as a substitute the form given in N.A. 84. This is not so good as that contained in the Ordination of Priests, and we would strongly advocate that form being used also for Deacons. It runs as follows:

> The Bishop: Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation

through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures?

ANSWER: I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace.

The financial difficulty is a very real one, but it is also real in many other callings. Not only has the cost of living risen; the standard of living has risen also. We need as a nation to return to more simple ways, and to set a lower value on sport and pleasure and the externals of life. There are many intellectual pleasures, and also many aesthetic ones, that cost little in money, but they seem to have no attraction for either the new rich or the new poor. The really serious thing for a clergyman is not whether he can afford to keep a motor-car, but whether he can afford to marry and educate his sons. If we are to undertake a further financial reform in connection with the clergy, we would urge that reform take, not the further increasing of the income of benefices, but the more directly helpful way of giving adequate educational grants to clergymen with children of school-age. 'The greatest and the best part of the English priesthood have been the sons of priests,' said a mediaeval archbishop in defending clerical marriage; and the knowledge by a young man that if he were ordained he would not be debarred from marriage and bringing up a well-educated family would remove the poverty disability from priesthood. The present clerical incomes are quite adequate for a celibate priesthood.

The Bishop of Gloucester's note to the Report deserves attention. Dr. Headlam writes:

> I do not disagree with the report, but I do not think that it puts the matter in its right proportions. The real problem is: why a large number of persons who have a certain amount of private means, and therefore are, to a certain extent, independent of the financial position, used to take Orders and do not do so now? That is the problem before us. Now the reason, I believe, is this: the secularization of our modern life generally and of our education system in particular.

The Bishop's question touches the centre of the problem with a needle. We do not altogether agree with his answer, especially when the Bishop, in developing his statement, asserts that Oxford and Cambridge are 'largely secular, and to a considerable

extent even antagonistic to Christianity.' We do think that they are 'anti-clerical,' which is quite another affair, and that they are certainly indifferent to the kind of Christian teaching they are receiving—or rather refusing to receive. The remedy is not a quick or easy one. Dr. Headlam's conclusion, however, seems to us to be sound. It is the conclusion of a statesman:

> 'The main remedy for the existing state of things must be found in the Universities, both in Oxford and Cambridge, and in the newer universities. I think the Church should concentrate its attention much more than it does on religious work in our universities and in attacking the intellectual problems of religion.'

Certainly, if the cause of Christianity be lost in the English universities, it is lost for the English nation. Benjamin Jowett saw and proclaimed that truth to a largely unheeding Church some forty years ago, and the late Dean of Carlisle at a subsequent period did the same. We have yet to see the result of their heroic endeavours.

A Fight in the Dark.

In the April-May *Modern Churchman* (pp. 92-95), in dealing with the American religious situation we published the full text of

> An Act to prohibit the teaching in public schools and other public institutions of learning, Darwinism, atheism, agnosticism, or evolution as it pertains to the origin of man.

Although this measure was defeated by one vote in the legislature of the State of Kentucky, it was victorious in that of Tennessee. The American newspapers now report a prosecution under the Act. A school teacher, John T. Scopes, has been indicted for violating the Act. The trial will take place at Dayton, a small backwoods town. Great preparations are being made to accommodate the Press and the public. The notable ex-Vice-President of the United States, W. J. Bryan, will act as leading counsel for the prosecution. This is most appropriate, as it was Mr. Bryan who secured the passing of the Act. Mr. Scopes will be defended by Mr. Clarence Darrow of Chicago, an Agnostic and Socialist, who enjoys a great reputation for the successful defence of criminals. It is said that he will be able to secure without fee the assistance of as many scientific and educational experts as he desires.

It is impossible to view the prosecution as otherwise than deplorable, and that in two ways. First, it will give the impression that the United States is a much more obscurantist country than it really is, and that the standard of popular education is extraordinarily low. This cannot but be painful for a self-conscious people who have been and are making remarkable progress in education. Secondly, whether Mr. Scopes be condemned or acquitted, the effect will prove detrimental to the influence of the Christian religion in American life, because the trial is certain to lead to wrong issues. The Tennessee Act makes it a misdemeanour for a person to teach in any state institution 'any theory that denies the story of the divine creation of man as taught in the Bible, and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals,' or that 'disregards, denies, or brings into disrepute' the Genesis narrative. Hence if Mr. Scopes be convicted of teaching evolution, it will be claimed that he was convicted of denying the divine creation of man and that man shares in the divine nature and under human conditions reflects the divine likeness. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory, for if Mr. Scopes be a Modernist, and not simply an Anti-Fundamentalist, he will be ready to affirm the divine creation of man, although man has not been created by a divine fiat but by an evolutionary process, and to acknowledge that his ancestors may be traced back through every order of biological life to protoplasm. If, on the other hand, Mr. Scopes be acquitted, it may be proclaimed far and wide that the Bible is discredited and that the Genesis narrative is false. This would be a mistake. Its essence is true, but its form is poetry, not science. We have no desire to see a fight which will merely lead to Materialism triumphing over Fundamentalism, or to Fundamentalism triumphing over Materialism, for in either case the result is bound to prove detrimental to rational, moral and spiritual influences in American life.

To the Fundamentalists we can only apply the phrase which fell from the lips of John Huss as a good old woman brought forward a little faggot to assist his burning, *O sancta simplicitas!* As for the American evolutionists, if they prevail let them take care that their science prove not, in Tennyson's phrase, 'a procuress for the lords of hell.'

The Twelfth Conference of Modern Churchmen.

The annual conference of Modern Churchmen will take place this year at Oxford in the last week of August. It is open to all who are interested in the subject. The authorities of Somerville and St. Hugh's Colleges, as last year, have kindly placed their buildings at the disposal of the Conference Committee. The meetings of the Conference will be held in the Debating Hall of the Oxford Union—a more spacious and quiet spot than that in which they were held last year. The Conference sermons will be preached on Sunday, August 30th, in Christ Church Cathedral in the morning, and at St. Mary-the-Virgin (the University Church) in the evening. Thus members of the Conference who are not themselves Oxonians will feel, it is hoped, during the Conference week that they are as far as possible in the atmosphere, not merely of Oxford, but of the University. The President and Standing Committee of the Oxford University Union have given support to this (as we venture to hope) pleasing illusion by offering the privileges of temporary membership to all men attending the Conference. It is unfortunately beyond their power to do so in the case of women members.

The Conference subject this year, 'The Faith of a Modern Churchman,' will prove less technical than that of last year, but not less interesting. The charge is often made against Modernism that it is destructive and negative. The papers read at the coming Conference will be found to be constructive and positive, and should, with the Conference debates, provide for the hard-pressed Modernist engaged in teaching and parochial work a useful apologetic for the faith which is in him and which he wishes others to share. The Modern Churchmen's Conferences will with this year have reached their twelfth, and there are indications that with this one they may complete the series. They have formed a useful occasion for reunion to liberal Churchmen living in comparative isolation. The situation is now rapidly changing, and the need for such gatherings is much less than it was when they were initiated. Not a few of the leading members of the earlier Conferences have passed hence, and others who used to attend now feel very properly that they serve the cause of Modernism best by attending conferences of other types.

THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY AND RELIGION

By Julian Huxley, Fellow of New College, Oxford, Author of *Essays of a Biologist.*

(*Second and Concluding Article.*)

THE problem that posed itself after our analysis of Huxley's relation to the religious life of his time was this—what would be his attitude to that of the present if he were in his prime to-day?

First, then, we must remind ourselves of the changes which have come over the scene between then and now—changes in professing Christianity itself; changes both in the popular and in the specialist knowledge of the diverse forms of religions, with a consequent change in orientation and attitude to the problem; the changes consequent upon the rise of psychology to an autonomous and important science; a change in the relative importance ascribed to creed and worship, theological dogma and religious experience; changes seen in the spread of evolutionary outlook, in the pushing of the evolutionary idea to its logical conclusions, and in the emergence of a fuller body of evolutionary principle.

To take this last point first, we must remember that in Huxley's day the doctrine of inevitable progress was still seriously maintained by men of reputation and importance like Spencer. This was, properly enough, repugnant to Huxley's sturdier common-sense. He countered it, not by urging a modified or limited doctrine of progress, but by emphasizing the undeniable fact that vice equally with virtue, degeneration equally with advance, ruthless selfishness equally with altruism, were all products of evolution, and that stationary persistence of type was to be found as well as constant change.

To-day I do not think even the most ardently orthogenetic biologist would dream of advocating *inevitable* progress. It, like other dreams of the eighteenth century's humanism, has crumbled when confronted with fact by rigorous critics, most notable among whom in recent years has been Dean Inge. With the decay of this aprioristic and proselytizing belief, however, the field lay open for those, more patient, who, instead of asserting what ought to happen, set out to discover what had actually

happened. Their analysis made it abundantly plain that if organic life is considered as a whole there is found, in spite of degeneration and stagnancy, of cruelty and stupidity, an observable direction in its evolution. This direction can be recognized as tending towards the raising of the upper level of achievement attained by life in respect of certain qualities, such as power, efficiency, harmony of parts, and improvement of mental life. Further, since these qualities are on the whole qualities which to man appear good, it is perfectly legitimate to drop the non-committal term *evolutionary direction* and to use in its place that of *biological progress*.

That being so, the antagonism between the cosmic process and human aims is seen to be not nearly so radical as Huxley endeavoured to prove it in his Romanes lecture. The direction in which both are tending is the same or similar: it is the methods and the pace which are so different. The methods of prehuman evolution are chiefly (though not wholly) those of struggle and elimination, of blind and fortuitous variation sifted by a ruthless natural selection. Those of human evolution come to be more and more those of intelligent guidance and control, the substitution of conscious purpose for unconscious and random variation, of prevention before the event for elimination after, of co-operation for the struggle of each against all. There is, too, a coming into being of values which previously had not existed.

By these means the evolutionary process is accelerated, and raised in large part on to a new plane. It is our duty to keep it on this plane so far as possible, and this we can only do by employing methods very different from those employed by evolving life in previous epochs. But the whole process is a continuous one, and there is no need for any radically Manichean attitude towards non-human 'Nature.'

This leads to another corollary of the evolutionary idea which had not been properly appreciated in Huxley's time. In any movement or process of change, the rate must be considered as well as the direction. A general who wishes to move an army rapidly across country might be forced to abandon certain types of heavy transport because they hindered his mobility: they would go in the direction he wanted, but they would not go fast enough. As a matter of everyday observation, one has only to

reflect upon the moral and political likes and dislikes of mankind to perceive that a large proportion of the things which men call bad are so stigmatized because they are moving either faster or slower than men like, and not because they offend against any absolute canon of goodness.

If one's thought has the evolutionary background, one must postulate an optimum rate as well as an optimum direction of evolutionary progress: and if this be admitted, then even things or processes which are moving in the right direction may be evil if they are moving too slowly and so retarding the process as a whole. In fine, the ideas of evolution have made it possible, and indeed necessary, to transfer the simple concepts of relative motion from mechanics to morality.

In this way what is good in one epoch may become harmful for another: and this, too, we must discount unless we are to over-emphasize the antinomy between the microcosm and the macrocosm, between the ideals of man and the slow-grinding processes of the rest of the universe.

Finally, the analysis of thinkers like Bergson and Lloyd Morgan has reminded us that to trace back a thing or a process to simpler origins does not explain it or simplify its essence. The mental processes of an adult man are partly conditioned by those of his childish years, but are in themselves of quite different nature.

Owing to the rise of psychology and of the comparative study of religion, the general attitude of the religious body is far less rigid to-day than fifty years ago. Very few educated people would now maintain that their own religion was wholly and exclusively 'true' and all others completely 'false.' Religion itself is seen as evolving, and as adapting itself, albeit incompletely, to the changing conditions of civilization.

The psychological analysis of men like Shand and McDougall has made it possible for us to assert that the religious sentiment' (in the strict psychological sense) is one which normally, though by no means necessarily, becomes organized in human minds developing in any usual human environment. In the normal adolescent and adult it is there, waiting an outlet for its expression.

Furthermore, the recent developments of psychology following on the work of W. James and of Freud have shown that a

great many phenomena of the religious life which were supposed to require direct divine intervention can be readily accounted for on simpler hypotheses—phenomena such as conversion, sense of grace, visions and inspiration, mystical experience and sense of communion with God, etc. As indicated above, this does not necessarily take away from their intrinsic value: but it makes our attitude towards them other than that of our forbears.

Finally we come to what I see as the crux of the problem. I can see Huxley responding to the increased emphasis laid by the Churches upon the intrinsic value of religious experience. He would say that religious experience is a natural phenomenon like any other, an outcome of the psychic structure of man, and that, if it is thought of in a sensible way, it is to be encouraged in so far as beautiful and satisfying in itself and as conducive to a richer and better life. I can see him admitting the practical necessity of certain forms of religious symbolism, once the Churches admitted that they were symbolic. I can see him rejoicing in the victory of truth and common-sense involved in the gradual abandonment of the belief in the miraculous as a necessary element in religion. I can see him welcoming the view of the more advanced among the leaders of religious thought that religion is no supernatural gift (or infliction!), but a natural phenomenon—one of the highest of natural phenomena, but not supernatural. But I cannot see him coming to terms over the idea of a God who is either personal or superpersonal.

As I pointed out in my previous article, the idea of a personal God, in a position towards the world essentially like that of an absolute ruler to his nation and country, with the added property of creator, permeated the orthodoxy with which Huxley found himself confronted. This idea carried with it such corollaries as the ready possibility of miracle, the validity of purely petitionary prayer, or the idea of propitiatory sacrifice.

This concept, as well as the Absolute of the metaphysicians, Huxley countered with Agnosticism. 'There *may* be such a Being,' he would in effect say, 'but none of the evidence presented satisfies me in the least that there actually *is*. That being so, it is not merely a waste of time for me to discuss the matter until more evidence is adduced, but definitely wrong to

base any conclusions, theoretical or practical, upon the assumption of His existence.'

But to-day the liberal wing of religious thought rejects all naïve creationism; rejects miracles; sees in prayer a special form of meditation, of value for the spiritual results which it engenders in the praying mind; sees sacrifice as a discipline for the self, not a propitiation of an external power. And the relation of God to the universe is in general conceived either as still personal but more remote or, more pantheistically, as immanent and therefore less personal.

I feel fairly confident that Huxley would have continued the 'anthropological' line of attack so brilliantly begun in his *Evolution of Theology*, for which the work of men like Frazer would have provided him with inexhaustible material. I can see him arguing along some such lines as these: 'The idea of God or Gods is one which is found in the religious beliefs of the majority of men. It is thus a natural phenomenon, to be investigated by science equally with the colour of men's skins or their power to perform mathematical calculations. I will therefore try to investigate it, from as dispassionate and externalized a standpoint as possible, from the evidence which the anthropologists and psychologists have so painstakingly amassed.'

If he had done so, he could not very well have escaped certain conclusions. In the first place, there has been a notable progressive evolution of the idea of God in man's mind. We have only to remind ourselves of the tendency from polytheism to monotheism, and of monotheism to become less and less anthropomorphic. In the second place, it is obvious that the relations (as envisaged by man) of Divinity to the phenomenal universe have become progressively less immediate. Primitive man may suppose a God to inhere in the humblest objects; the idea that striking or unusual natural occurrences, such as thunder, earthquake or pestilence, are the direct result of a Divine operation is widespread up to a late stage in religious development; so, too, is a belief in the local preferences of particular divinities. Furthermore, the Divinity in the course of time comes to have progressively less to do with the operation of nature. Whereas to primitive man the causation of the simplest phenomena is sought in the capricious and free-will activities of spiritual beings, this conception is gradually replaced by that of natural

law. With Galileo and Newton, natural law was seen to extend to all mechanical phenomena, and the physical and chemical worlds were not long in following suit. With Darwin and nineteenth century physiology, the same was achieved for the organic world; and twentieth century psychology is extending the achievement to the world of mind. The stars in their courses demand a God to uphold them neither more nor less than does a falling raindrop to direct its course; the different types of animals require a Creator no more than a lump of clay or a drop of water; nor does the sense of ecstasy or of inspiration demand communion with or direction by a Divine person any more than common sensation or the simplest operations of arithmetic.

In other words, God or Gods are first conceived of as the active agents in natural phenomena; later, as directing or guiding them; until finally, with the extension of the discovery of natural law by science, the place of possible relation between God and phenomena becomes (unless we revert to pantheism) more and more remote, until finally the remoteness threatens to become immeasurable.

There are two ways of interpreting these facts. One is to say that the idea of God is an idea framed by man to account, on some unitary basis, for all the varied manifestations with which he is confronted in nature and in his own mind and his relations with other men. Since he himself is a spiritual and personal being, he has almost invariably ascribed spirit and personality to the entity which he postulates as causing or directing phenomena. The idea of God is therefore a convenient symbolism for grasping under a single head the multifarious activities of the universe in their relation to man.

The other possible interpretation is to grant the symbolism, to grant also its frequent imperfection, but to say that it is not only symbolism, but in some degree a representation of a reality, but a reality too large and too complex for us to grasp entire.

As between these two views, I do not think Huxley would have hesitated. He would have accepted the first. The latter he would not have rejected, but would have confronted it with his agnosticism, and by so doing have sterilized it and enfeebled its practical value. For, be it observed, the conception underlying it is essentially that of the static orthodoxy of Huxley's day, only with numerous complications added. The Absolute

God exists in some way behind phenomena; and the actual God or Gods worshipped by men are incomplete and symbolic representations of the Absolute God. But no method is suggested, save that of miraculous intervention, by which man's beliefs as to the nature of his actual 'anthropological' Gods can be brought into relation with, and made real representations of, the postulated Absolute God beyond.

Furthermore, the observed facts can be explained without any such assumption; and Huxley was not one to disregard the principle of the economy of hypothesis.

But even if he had adopted the first alternative he might have taken up one of two attitudes towards it. On the one hand, he could have continued the intransigeant attitude of combatant nineteenth century science. 'Your idea of God,' he might say, is a symbol, a personification of natural forces. Such a method of thinking is an infantile one, to be abandoned as soon as scientific investigation provides an account in accurate terms of the intellect. Besides, your formulation is not only inadequate; it is dangerous. You first personify the powers of the universe; you then assume that your symbol is reality; you then apply deductive reasoning to this assumed reality and regulate your life according to the conclusions logically drawn from these premisses. Not only this, but since there exists no verificatory check on your speculations, you personify in your God not only the facts of nature but your own desires. Your own desires are unfortunately not always good, and so we have the genesis of jealous Gods, revengeful Gods, proud and ultra-patriotic Gods, not to mention the foibles of the polytheistic pantheon.'

On the other hand, he might equally well argue thus: 'Granted that a personified God is a symbol, yet our anthropological study has shown that it has always represented, with greater or lesser faithfulness, certain definite realities of Nature. If therefore I reject what seems to me the false symbolism of divine personality, a perfectly definite residuum of meaning still attaches to the term God—as definite a meaning as that in the term 'beauty,' or 'modern European civilization.' It is a term for the powers operating in Nature (including in Nature, of course, oneself and other men) in so far as they enter into relation with human life, intellectual, emotional, or moral. It is not true to say that we want no such term once the methods of

science have provided us with a scientific analysis of phenomena. Such an analysis is always discursive, and always incomplete. We want a unitary term, because it is important to bring ourselves as units into some sort of relation with the universe as a unit, and because the existence of proper terms facilitates thought and action. I therefore retain the term God to denote this very important concept, but deliberately reject the idea of personality in God. The purging of the concept of God of any inherent notion of personality is to me a further step in the evolution of the idea of God, comparable, for instance, to the step from polytheism to monotheism.'

Which of these views he would have adopted it is hard to say. But he would have certainly refused to accept a personal God. He would have denied our ability to extract a knowledge of the personality of the Absolute; but would have been convinced that the personality of the actually-worshipped or anthropological Gods had been entirely supplied by human agency.

But, finally, we can readily see him pushing forward his *Anthropological Study* and making a profound survey of religion as a natural phenomenon—a real Natural History or Biology of Religion. Such a task he could have brilliantly accomplished. Starting from the known inherited mental make-up of man and the fact that men live inside a certain range of environment and tradition, he would have traced the necessary emergence of religion and its gradual evolution. How richly could he have castigated the folly and the emotional and moral bias of early religions, and with what ruthless skill exposed how from false assumptions sprang false conclusions, and how failure to use the critical powers of the intellect led in the long run too often to cruelty, strife, intolerance and hostility to new truth.

But how vividly at the close could he have pointed out for us the direction in which religion is evolving and must evolve, and the conditions which it must obey if it is to play its part in a harmonious civilization. He would have made clear to us how in any developed religion the emotional, the intellectual, and the practical aspects are all necessary and interdependent. Morality that is solely practical is not religious, not even if it be intellectually illumined too. He knew well enough that religion is in the first instance an emotional reaction. But he

knew equally that this emotional reaction could be, in itself and in its results, either good or bad; and that it could not be wholly or mainly good unless it permeated and was permeated by all other parts of our life, including our intellectual and our practical activities. To be religious in any satisfying way we must, among other things, love truth for its own sake—not for its pragmatic value; and we must do good because we desire the good, not merely because we find it pays to respect the views and conventions of society.

He might well, under the influence of recent psychology, have come to realize more fully the value of ritual as a directly-felt expression of religious sentiment; and of the more 'mystical' types of religious experience as possessing intrinsic value in the same way as does aesthetic experience or the experience of love. And as a naturalist he would have been the first to admit that different individuals would be expected to excel in and to lay emphasis on different aspects of the religious life.

He himself, in any age or circumstances, would have emphasized the moral and intellectual sides. In a letter of 1892 he writes to Romanes:

> 'I have a great respect for the Nazarenism of Jesus—very little for later "Christianity." But the only religion that appeals to me is prophetic Judaism. Add to it something from the best Stoics, and something from Spinoza and something from Goethe, and there is a religion for men.'

In any epoch he would have been a most valuable contributor to religious thought, in that he would in any circumstances have helped in clarifying the natural vagueness of the average man's beliefs, and have aided in opposing the normal tendency of strongly-felt religious emotion to claim too much in the spheres of intellect and practice and to set itself up as an absolute standard untempered by tolerance or by the self-criticism of reason.

I do not think that he would have found his views compatible with any form of Christianity as held to-day. Although he would have welcomed the change in outlook which has taken place in the liberal wing of the Church, he would, I am convinced, have seen in it a change which was running parallel with what he conceived to be the right line, but not on the right line itself. Between those two parallel lines a gulf still opens. It is far narrower than it was; but still as profound, and still unbridged.

SPIRITUAL HEALING

By Douglas White, M.D., Chairman of the Council of the Churchmen's Union.

THE healing of bodily infirmities by spiritual means is a subject of perplexing interest to many Christian folk; to such it may be helpful to hear the views of a member of the medical profession who, like many of his fraternity, is trying to be a Christian.

In the popular idea, healing is often divided into two categories; one, healing that is brought about by chemical or mechanical means, that is, by the activity of the physician or surgeon; the other, by spiritual or mental means, through the psychologist or faith-healer. From the medical standpoint this distinction is an error. In all cases Nature is the great healer. Whatever the physician or surgeon does, by drugs or surgery, is only helping Nature to do her healing work. So far as we know at present, even the drugs which we call 'specifics,' namely, those which are known to exert a beneficial influence on particular diseases,—such as quinine, arsenic, salicylates—do not act directly but indirectly, either by weakening the disease germs or by adding some needed element to the resisting organism. The surgeon can place a broken limb in position; he can remove certain material, either diseased tissues or their products, with which nature unaided cannot cope. But in either case the cure lies with Nature; the doctor can help and direct; but without the curative power of nature, he is helpless. That curative power belongs to human nature—or animal nature—as a whole; not body alone, nor mind alone, but the combined powers of the whole living organism. Both mind and body are expressions of the whole human life; that life is a unity.

The influence of mind on body is undoubted, as also is the influence of body on mind. The mind cannot work normally, when the body is in pain or is poisoned with products of disease. Conversely the body falls into ill-health when the mind is disturbed by conflicts, worry, fear, or despair. Even death is said to have resulted from an accepted suggestion of fatal injury, whether false or true.

During human life, body and mind cannot be separated, for they form indeed one life. That is true from the moment of

conception to the moment of death. The first essential is to rid ourselves of a dualistic conception of our own lives, as if our bodies come from Nature and our souls from God. All life is one, and all comes from Nature's God.

It is then a general truth that body and mind act and react each on the other: but that reaction varies in potency; the mind exerts a more powerful and constant control in some directions than in others. Our voluntary muscles exemplify the greatest control of body by mind. The will can keep muscular effort in train until the muscles are utterly exhausted, or choked by their own waste products; even this power, as we all know, has its limits. But the vital processes, such as the action of the heart and lungs, act independently of conscious volition. The heart beats; you cannot stop it nor quicken it by taking thought; yet even this most vital organ is not separate from the mind, since it is affected powerfully by emotion. Breathing goes on independently of your thought; but here you can breathe deeper, or quicker or slower—yet only for a limited time. You can stop breathing—perhaps for the inside of a minute; or you can breathe hard and deep—for about the same time; then you have to let go.

Thus there are various limitations to the power of mind over body, and *vice versâ*. Those limits are perhaps wider than we used to think; yet there are limits. If this be accepted, then we are bound to deal with the body by external means as well as by mental influence. This fact we all recognize implicitly when we wash dirt off our bodies or when we cut our nails. They will not clean or cut themselves. The influence of mind cannot draw the broken fragments of a leg into apposition.

God has given us our minds, not only for thinking and willing, but also for perceiving and for taking the action dictated by our understanding. This is not a denial of our spiritual powers, but an acceptance of our intellect as a part of our spiritual make-up. It is positively wicked not to use surgical methods for the cure of otherwise incurable ailments, or to fail to treat specific infections with known remedies. That were to deny the divine origin of intellect and knowledge.

But, you may ask me, what are the limitations of the power of mind over body? Can you say that one kind of disease is curable by mental or spiritual means, and another not? Theo-

retically perhaps it is impossible to draw a perfectly sharp line; in some respects the line is blurred and shaded; but it exists.

Diseases may be divided into two main categories; the one is called functional, the other organic. I confess that until a few years ago I had my doubts as to the soundness of this distinction; but I am now convinced of its truth.

Organic disease exists where there is definite, visible or palpable injury to the body substance. It may only be visible to the microscope. Where it cannot be seen it may be felt; when it is impalpable (cannot be felt), yet it may be judged of by signs and symptoms. Organic illnesses are those which are brought about in the body by injury or disease, the latter resulting either from invasion by germs, or growths (which may be independent of germs), or by failure in adaptation of some glandular organ, illnesses which are often termed constitutional. These are all organic; they result from some disturbance of a bodily structure.

Functional disease is that which is brought about by mental derangement, that is, by something causing disturbance of the mind, whether consciously or unconsciously, so that it no longer operates in harmony with the bodily functions. By mental derangement, I do not mean insanity, but some kind of mental disturbance which causes a gap or discontinuity between the body (in some respect) and the spirit which normally directs its activity. This gap causes a lack of control over the bodily movements or sensations; thus the body may suffer from various ailments—impairment or loss of vision, hearing, or other sensation, loss of the faculty of speech, loss of power over limbs, disturbance of circulation or digestion. When so caused, these are called functional complaints, which have their origin, not in the body, but in the mind; and they are capable of being healed, immediately or gradually, by restoration of the mental equilibrium. So far as we know, such ailments do not result in organic bodily disease, except, perhaps, in rare instances, from atrophy of certain muscles from disuse, or impairment of other structures from a similar cause. These also are naturally the diseases which are most readily subject to mental or spiritual healing.

This is not to say that the state of mind does not influence the state of the body in health or in organic disease. It is only to say that there are fairly well-defined limits to the potency of

mind over body; that such influence is marvellously potent in one class or category of disease, and relatively impotent in another.

We men of medicine believe that this limitation of the power of mind over body is a permanent fact of human life, though we may be unable precisely to define it. We can, however, point to extreme cases where the limitation is absolute. We have been taught by physiologists to believe, for example, that if the nerve substance of the central nervous system—brain or spinal cord—is destroyed in any part, it cannot be restored. Now the eye, as far as the optic nerve and retina is concerned, is an outgrowth from, and, for all practical purposes, part of, the central nervous system. If the optic nerve is destroyed by atrophy, permanent blindness (according to this belief) must result. That condition in its final state, at any rate, can be readily diagnosed by any skilled oculist, for it can be seen from outside by means of the ophthalmoscope. If sight were to be restored to such an one by any form of mental attitude or suggestion, the medical profession would have to confess themselves wrong and to reform their ideas; but so far there is no authenticated case of such a cure.

At the other end of the scale is the manifold variety of easily recognized complaints of a purely functional character which are capable of mental treatment and cure, since they have their origin in mental disturbance. In each case we do our best by seeking the root of the mischief, whether in the body or mind.

It is perhaps needless to add that in many cases where the origin of the trouble is bodily, yet the state of the mind needs attention, though it be secondary. Enteric fever, for example, runs its regular course: it causes mental disturbance in various ways; the course may be helped or hindered by drugs, food, environment. It is needful that the mind be kept as far as possible at rest: yet no one would pretend that the actual febrile process was the direct result of the mental or spiritual attitude; the course of enteric is substantially the same for an archbishop as for a crossing-sweeper, and, with present hospital conditions, little more favourable in circumstance for the one than for the other.

Now any of my readers may hold opinions regarding the power of mind over body, which differ materially, in degree,

from what I have outlined. But what I want to make clear to all is that our whole lives and personalities, whether they be called body and mind, or body, soul and spirit, are all of a piece and form one spiritual whole. The body is not separable from its life till it becomes a corpse : nor is the life of the spirit separable, so long as life lasts, from the living body. The whole life—if any of it—is the gift of God, the body as much as the soul, the intellect as much as the emotions or will. The understanding which we acquire of the processes of life is a spiritual thing, no less than our religious emotions. Either of these two may be misused or abused, but we dare not exalt one to the denial of the other. If we should use our intellect to rule out of court the knowledge, or the application of the knowledge, which men have gained by the use of their intellect, then we are using our intellect to rule itself out of court and to deny its own validity. The intellect may be used to correct or amplify the work of previous intellects, but not to invalidate the intellectual process itself.

In the process, therefore, of exalting our spiritual faculties, there is no call to suspect or belittle the results of our knowledge in the sphere of medicine or surgery; rather should we welcome all beneficial additions to our knowledge. But there is one more aspect of the matter which we must not overlook.

The art of healing is by no means limited to those proceedings of physic and surgery which result from knowledge of the processes of Nature : the mind of the physician or surgeon reacts on that of the patient. The sympathetic and cheering influence of the man counts for more than we are apt to think; personal confidence works wonders. The direct effect of mind on mind is illustrated not only by medicine, but is seen in all social activity. We all know how the individual, say at a public meeting, is drawn into the mood of the crowd, whether it be a mood of enthusiasm, anger or panic : we also see a speaker of certain qualities grip and sway a crowd as he will, not by the force of his reasoning, but by some other more subtle influence, which we realize, but cannot describe except in vague terms. In the matter of healing, too, one mind may become gripped and in some sort possessed by another; such a condition may well exercise some pronounced effect on the bodily state of the patient, but such effect will be mainly emotional and transitory; unless the suggested hopes are founded on truth, results may be

disappointing or even harmful. Yet the direct operation of mind upon mind, in the matter of healing, is often of as great importance as the giving of a drug, and may be a not insignificant adjunct even to the results of operative surgery. The possession of such personal powers contribute in no small degree to the success of eminent members of the profession. But do not let us think that ignorance of medicine and surgery can be compensated by a masterful or impressive personality.

In any case let us rid ourselves once for all of the idea that part of us is a material mechanism and part an immortal spirit. All cure of every disease is spiritual in the sense that it is a manifestation of the urge of human life which is all spiritual. Healing can never be imposed from without by either the surgeon or physician; it is the living organism which, helped by the skill of the one or the other, is enabled to work its way back to health. The whole principle of healing in all cases is the *vis medicatrix naturæ*. And when we speak of Nature, we are only personifying the principle of life which Christians call God.

I have spoken of our whole lives being essentially spiritual. Our bodies indeed are less so in degree than our minds; in this respect the material lags behind the immaterial. Nevertheless, through spiritualization of the whole life, the body also is lifted into the higher realm; for our bodies tend in time to become the expression of our spirits. We cannot hold one philosophy of the body and another of the mind. We must either believe that our whole lives are bound for a spiritual destination, or we have to assume a purposeless mechanistic materialism. On the one hand lies a gradually expanding freedom, on the other a rigid determinism. In my belief we poor mortals, in all our social arts and efforts, whether they be for healing or other ends, are reaching out our hands towards a spiritual purpose; we feel it with our finger-tips, but as yet it eludes our grasp. If that be true, we must follow the lead of more than one of our foremost physiologists, and admit that this spiritual philosophy must somehow include the whole of nature of which we ourselves are but one, albeit perhaps the highest, expression; it must include at least all of life, animal or plant, and even, ultimately, inorganic nature as well; till we are driven in logic, as well as in emotion, to believe that

> so the whole round earth is every way
> Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

JOHN COLET

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

WHEN Luther was seventeen and Savonarola fourteen years old, and three years before the birth of Machiavelli, John Colet was born. Sir Henry Colet, twice Lord Mayor of London, and one of the wealthiest members of the Mercers' Company, was able to secure for his son those advantages which contemporary opinion allowed. Before his ordination, and while still in his minority, the youth had conferred upon him a number of benefices. There is no reason to conclude that he fulfilled any of the duties, which indeed he was not legally entitled to perform. His studies absorbed his attention.

Colet spent seven years at Oxford before taking his M.A. degree, perhaps as a member of Magdalen College. Here there was no part of mathematics in which 'he was not seen above his years'; he studied, not without tedium, the scholastic philosophy of the day, and eagerly devoured all the Latin classics, particularly Cicero. He also read Plato and Plotinus in recent Latin translations.

On leaving Oxford, the eager youth travelled in Italy—the promised land of culture, learning, and romance. Here he turned impatiently from Augustine, Duns Scotus, and Aquinas to Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, and, above all, to the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, where the student of Plotinus would find himself at home. It is possible that he met Ficino, 'that old pagan,' who had translated the *Enneads*.

Having returned to England, Colet was, in December, 1497, ordained deacon, and, in March of the following year, priest. He continued to reside in Oxford, where he began to disseminate the new knowledge and the new spirit. He delivered a course of public lectures in Latin on the *Epistle to the Romans*. It was upon the Vulgate text that he lectured, for he had only begun to study Greek in Italy, and never seems to have attained a complete mastery of the language.[1] Yet though the text was old, the method was new.

[1] Such, at any rate, is the view of Mr. C. E. Mallet in his *History of the University of Oxford* (1925).

The traditional, or scholastic, method of interpreting Scripture was primarily allegorical. The admonition 'The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life,' means, being interpreted, 'The literal sense killeth, the spiritual sense giveth life.' Colet swept traditional methods aside, and substituted for these a free critical exposition of the text as a whole. The lecturer had the easy and attractive eloquence of the learned enthusiast. His discourses seemed to the acutest critic of the day 'like a liquid fountain flowing out of the abundance of the heart.' 'You have the happy art,' wrote the same friend, 'of expressing with ease what others can hardly express with the greatest labour.' The course on *Romans* was followed by another on I *Corinthians*, in which the lecturer applied his new methods with increasing boldness. To both courses Erasmus was an eager listener, and the friendship, which lasted until the death of Colet, began.

The antipathy of the latter towards the scholastics was of long standing, and lasted all his life. More advanced in this respect than Erasmus, he led his friend on, and taught him to criticise, not merely the degenerate scholasticism of the fifteenth century, but the infallible *Doctor Angelicus* himself. 'What!' he indignantly writes, 'do you extol to me such a man as Aquinas? If he had not been very arrogant indeed, he would not surely so rashly and proudly have taken upon himself to define all things'; and he elsewhere speaks of his 'preposterous philosophy.' It is interesting that Erasmus was a Scotist, and so was a ready listener to anti-Thomist polemic. But Scotist and Thomist were alike abominable to Colet.

Colet did not confine his biblical studies to the New Testament. About this time he composed a series of letters to one Radulphus, perhaps Ralph Collingwood, subsequently Dean of Lichfield (1512), who had been attempting to expound 'the dark places of Scripture,' beginning with Lamech's speech in *Genesis* iv, 23*f*. . . . Four of these letters are extant, and these deal with dark places in the first chapter of *Genesis*—which are to him as obscure as the abyss itself referred to in *Genesis* i, 2. With the freedom permitted to the mediaeval theologian so long as he did not *deny* the statement of Scripture (this was one advantage of the allegorical method!) Colet gives his interpre-

tation, suggested by de Lyra,[2] and Pico di Mirandola,[3] of the record of creation. *Genesis* i, 1 is an epitome of the whole. 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth'; that is He created all things at once in Eternity, both in form or thought (heaven) and in material (earth). What follows gives the order of things in terms of time. Colet expressed the view that the author of *Genesis* i used what is now known as the method of accommodation, and adapted his language and ideas to the mentality of his hearers. 'Moses,' he says, 'arranges his details after the manner of a popular poet, the better to adapt himself to the temper of rustic simplicity, fashioning a succession of events and times such as could not have been the work of the Almighty.' What this amounts to is that *Genesis* i is an attempt to present an eternal process in terms of time. This method of exegesis, typical of the early Platonists, though unhistorical, is notable for the freedom of thought involved. Colet's methods were less scientific than those of his predecessor, RogerPeacock, but they were an advance upon the views of his day, and even upon some of the views of our own time. This sixteenth century student would have dismayed our modern fundamentalists.

Colet's study of Plato and Plotinus was extended in Italy to cover the works of the Pseudo-Dionysius, that strange medley of Neo-platonism, Orientalism, and Christianity. This literature had been translated by Erigena in the ninth century, and in 1498 a new Latin edition had been published in Paris. Colet, like Ficino, regarded it as the authentic work of Dionysius the Areopagite, though this was soon disputed by Grocyn and Erasmus; and he drew up a series of abstracts of the *Celestial Hierarchy* and the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*. Upon these he based a number of treatises of which the *De Sacramentis Ecclesiae* and the *De Compositione Sancti Corporis Christi Mystici* are extant.

There can be little doubt that this literature had its effect upon the attitude of Colet towards ecclesiastical institutions.

[2] 'Moses was speaking to an uninstructed people, who could not take in spiritual ideas, but only gross and bodily ones, and on that account he made no express mention of the creation of angels' (*Biblia Latina cum Glossa*: Lupton, *Colet*, p. 249).

[3] *Heptaplus Johannis Pici Mirandolae de Septiformi sex dierum Geneseos Enarratione* (Seebohm, pp. 59 *f.*).

Though his personal religion (his deep piety strongly impressed his contemporaries) was exclusively a product of the New Testament, yet his view of the Church and its Sacraments seems to have been coloured by the neo-platonic idealism and sacramentalism which appealed so strongly to generations of mediaeval students of the pseudo-Dionysian writings. Thus his hatred of ecclesiastical abuses, and his loathing of superstition, were the products, not of anti-institutional bias, but of real love for, and appreciation of, the idea of a genuinely Catholic Church which should be the home of all true culture as well as of all true religion. His zeal for reform was the result of his dismay at the contrast presented by the Church of his day with the ideal of a Church which was to be found in the Pauline Epistles, and with the mystical idealism of the Areopagite—who had all the more authority for Colet because he believed him to have been the contemporary of the Apostle, who, as he somewhere says, 'seems to me to be a fathomless ocean of wisdom and piety.'[4] This it was that inspired him 'to bring all the knowledge and powers he possessed to purify the doctrines and practices of the Church.' And he undoubtedly believed that this purification could only come from that new spirit which an enlightened study of the Scriptures would generate. Thus his conviction was that 'the interpretation of Scripture was still the chief use to which knowledge could be put.'

It is notable that Colet, for all his idealism and zeal for reform, had no faith in the attractive and easy method of legislation. In his famous sermon of 1512, preached before Convocation (summoned to devise methods for the extirpation of the Lollard heresy), though he vigorously denounced the ignorance and self-indulgence of the clergy, he did not suggest the provision of new ecclesiastical machinery, nor even of fresh regulations to curb them.

> 'The way whereby the Church may be reformed into better fashion is not to make new laws. For there be laws many enough and out of number. . . . For the evils that are now in the Church were before in time past; and there is no fault but the Fathers have provided very good remedies for it. Therefore it is no need that new laws and constitutions be made, but that those which are made already be kept.'

[4] Although there is no direct evidence, Seebohm suggests that Colet's faith in the Areopagite was afterwards shaken. Yet even if Colet ceased to regard these writings as of *apostolic* authority, they would not have ceased to carry authority—and high authority—for him. Otherwise, why have troubled to paraphrase them—and (as Erasmus tells us) *from memory*?

Colet was a reformer but not an anti-clerical. We have it on the authority of More that Colet declared that the laity must beware if the clergy were naught, 'for it can be none other but that we must ever be one degree under them.'

The method in which Colet and his friends put their faith was the method of enlightenment. With the spread of education the weeds of superstition would be eradicated, and a more learned clergy would not need disciplinary regimentation.

While already at Oxford, Colet and the little band of scholars and reformers who made the university illustrious—Grocyn, Linacre, Erasmus—had the ear of educated England. But when, in 1504, Henry VII conferred on him the deanery of St. Paul's, Colet used his new position of influence to promote in London the ideals which he had at heart. He invited Grocyn and others to deliver divinity lectures in the cathedral, and himself preached frequent sermons in the manner of his Oxford lectures, often delivering them in continuous courses. It was at this time that More enjoyed the closest contact with Colet, and styled him his 'spiritual director.'

The death of Sir Henry Colet in 1505 left his son in the possession of vast wealth and able to put into visible shape some of his ideals of education. St. Paul's School, with its endowments, cost him something like £40,000 of our money. The famous scholar, William Lily, who had studied Greek in the East, and had visited Jerusalem, became the first master, and compiled a Latin grammar for the use of the scholars. The founder drew up some simple precepts for the guidance of his masters, together with an English version of the Creed and other prayers, besides an English paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, for the boys. Greek as well as Latin was to be taught in the school.

During the last years of his life Colet's interests seem to have centred in his school. It is possible that he may have begun to despair of the Church. His visit to the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury in 1514 seems to have utterly revolted him, and he had been delated for heresy after his Convocation sermon in 1512, though Warham sensibly dismissed the charges as frivolous. It seems evident, too, that the hopes placed by the party of enlightened reform in the young King (Henry VIII), who had seemed to be in some ways the embodiment of

the ideals of the Renaissance, were likely to prove vain. His ostentatious continental wars disgusted 'good Europeans' like Erasmus, and humanitarians like More and Colet, and the latter denounced them in several sermons. It is true that Henry, after an interview with Colet, said: 'Let every man have his own doctor; this is the doctor for me,' and made the preacher one of his chaplains. But it was the admonitions of Machiavelli, and not those of Colet, which eventually prevailed. Thomas Cromwell was the type that Henry made use of as an instrument of reform, and Colet, *felix opportunitate mortis*, died before that day came. 'Had he lived till the storm broke over England, he would have been found, one cannot help thinking, at More's side.'

However, whether he despaired of King, or Church, he did not despair of education. Yet this, he saw, must be set free. He believed in the layman as schoolmaster and the layman as governor. It was no ecclesiastical corporation that he appointed, in the last year of his life, as the governing body of his beloved school, but the Mercers' Company. It is impossible to exaggerate the significance of this innovation. It was expressly stated, too, that the acting governors were to be 'married citizens' and the masters married men. The tirades of Erasmus against monks and friars had not been spoken in vain. But another circumstance revealing the large-minded prevision of Colet was that he expressly gave permission to the school authorities to change its statutes in the future as occasion might require. This was something quite unprecedented at the time. 'No wonder,' More wrote to the founder, 'your school raises a storm, for it is like the wooden horse in which armed Greeks were hidden for the ruin of barbarous Troy.' The words were prophetic.

For some years before his death in 1519 Colet complained of ill health, and spoke of himself, though not yet fifty, as an old man. In 1516 he eagerly welcomed Erasmus' new Latin translation of the New Testament, and read with appreciation the *De Arte Cabalistica* (1517) of Reuchlin, the eminent Hebraist. When he died he was mourned by his friends, and by the friends of learning and civilisation, as irreplaceable. 'What a *man* has *England*, and what a *friend* have *I*, lost!' cried Erasmus.

The significance of Colet for English Churchmen lies in the

fact that he attempted a *concordat* between Christianity and culture. So far as groups of individuals were concerned, he succeeded, but failed in the sphere of the Church at large.

The reason of failure was that the Renaissance was the parent of some very diverse children. This sudden efflorescence produced, not only a new zeal for scholarship, a thirst for the things of the mind and the spirit, but a new lust for power, a new materialism, a new coarsening of values and ideals, a new vulgarity. It was Machiavelli, and not Erasmus, who got the upper hand. England was plunged into Thomas Cromwell's reign of terror, and Europe into exhausting wars. Hasty methods of reform were adopted—the political and legal triumphed over the spiritual. Fortunately the spirit which Colet had fostered in his schemes of education survived to create and inspire the Elizabethan Church in England. But the philistinism and savage dogmatism of Luther and Calvin divided the rest of Europe with the bigotry and cruelty of Rome, and Humanist ideals were overwhelmed by religious fanaticism and cruel avarice.

Colet impressed his contemporaries as a deeply religious man. 'He never travelled,' Erasmus tells us, 'without reading some book or conversing of Christ.' He had arranged His sayings in groups to assist the memory, and with the intention of writing a book on them. Indeed all his religious life seems to have centred more and more, as he grew older, in the person of Christ. 'He is in present enjoyment of that Christ whom he so loved when alive,' says the same friend, who also tells us that, though Colet was a man of genuine piety, he was not so by nature, but had become so by effort (or rather, perhaps, by grace). 'He told me he was not born with it. He was naturally hot, impetuous, and resentful—indolent, fond of pleasure and of women's society, and disposed to make a joke of everything. He told me he had fought against his faults with study, fasting, and prayer . . . '

Whatever hope there is for true progress to-day is to be found in the existence of men of the type of Colet—religious men, lovers of truth, yet not mere pietists or mere students. In the past the English Church has bred a succession of this type. Let us hope that it will at least provide an atmosphere which they can breathe in the future.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF PRAYER BOOK REVISION

THE OCCASIONAL OFFICES.

By the Rev. LESLIE S. HUNTER, M.A., Canon of Newcastle.

I HAVE narrowed the subject to the Occasional Offices because I still hold to the conviction of those who put forward the Grey Book that the revision of the Occasional Offices is of more moment to the life of the Church than the revision of the other parts of the Prayer Book. It would be a pity if the interesting and controversial discussions upon the Communion Service and Reservation should take away attention from the revision of those parts of the Prayer Book that need it most —which is what happened in the House of Clergy. I propose therefore to give a brief account, with comment, of what the House of Clergy has and has not done to the Occasional Offices, and then to conclude with one or two more general observations.

The Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure — N.A. 84—as it has left the House of Clergy[2] is not strictly speaking a revision, but an alternative book, or at least alternative services for permissive use. This is the price—some think a heavy price—which has been paid to those who wish no change for a revision that is more than verbal and superficial. The price will be worth paying in proportion as the alternatives are real alternatives, likely to meet the needs of future generations. (It is necessary continually to remind the timid ones that any revision will chiefly affect future churchmen.) We can at least take comfort in the thought that the confusion likely to arise from alternative services will not be more confused than the existing state of affairs.

Does the measure as it has left the House of Clergy provide really adequate alternatives? The answer is, yes and no. There is much for which to be thankful. The House has been bolder than the compilers of N.A. 84, though not bold enough.

[1] A Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Churchmen's Union, in London on May 26th, 1925.

[2] The Amendments of the House of Clergy have been published in book form by the Church Assembly (C.A. 158), price 1/-.

To a very considerable extent language has been simplified and archaisms and misleading quotations from Scripture left out. The patriarchs, of blessed memory, need no longer be held up to bridegrooms as examples of the way they should go. Here and there, the House has introduced a warmer, more human note, as for example in the prayer (optional) for the home in the Baptismal Service. Although it has protested—perhaps wisely—that the revision did not extend to theology, the revised services do, in fact, reflect a more consistently Christian conception of God. The Calvinism of the Baptismal Office has been greatly chastened, and a statement from the Grey Book of the purpose of Baptism, which the existing service leaves distressingly obscure, was in part accepted. While the Burial Service still lacks tenderness, the contradictions of belief have to some extent been modified by the provision of alternative psalms, etc. None the less, the House of Clergy seemed unable to distinguish between the note of severity fitting to a Christian burial and the note of terror that is unfitting, and would therefore allow no alternative to that magnificent but un-Christian passage which begins 'Man that is born of woman.' One hopes that the Bishops, observing this distinction, will remove the note of terror from this service and from the other services for the departed which the House of Clergy has asked them to provide. Prayers for the dead, well and good; but the Post-Communion Versicles and Responses in the Green Book (page 462) misrepresent both our Lord's doctrine of God and His pitifulness towards men.

On the whole, the House of Clergy was sensitive to the theological infelicities of the existing services. The thorough re-writing of the Office for the Sick in N.A. 84, for example, was cordially accepted. Mention must also be made of the excellent revision of the service which requires it least—the Order of Confirmation. Whereas the existing order emphasises the Christian's privilege of protection, in the alternative order it is his glad prerogative of service—a note to which healthy boys and girls will respond more readily.

On the other hand, the House (or rather the majority in it, for there was always a substantial minority in favour of a more generous revision) turned a dull ear to those who urged that the revised services should be more intelligible and human. For

example, it would not have a thanksgiving for the gift of children either in the Baptismal Service or the Churching—surely a fitting prayer on the lips of a parent. In the Order of Baptism, the promises have been kept more or less in existing form. The questions are still addressed to godparents as proxies for the child—an unreal fiction in the twentieth century. The majority of the House would not have them addressed to parents as well as to godparents, though in most cases the persons who answer for a child at the font have, perhaps fortunately, no part in its upbringing, and often never see it again. At its last session the House, by a narrow vote, decided, contrary to N.A.84, to revert to the question form of the Creed. The service is still intolerably long, containing four exhortations not in the vulgar tongue,[3] and even if said with indecent haste would take nearly four times as long as a baptism I attended in the Baptistry of Florence last month.

In the Marriage Service, the House approved a reference to the vocation of celibacy in the address to bride and bridegroom — when they are irrevocably committed to matrimony. Even more quaint is a proposal passed by the House of Laity to insert an address to them on divorce *immediately* after the nuptial knot has been tied.

In the Burial Service, the House was reluctant to see how unedifying edification can be when people are broken with sorrow; and it preferred a staid ecclesiastical prayer for the departed to a simple, human prayer which was first published in *Revised Services for Modern Churchmen* and included in the Grey Book.

Small points these perhaps are; but they indicate how slowly we of the Clergy are to recognize the gulf between the official ecclesiastical attitude to the needs and tensions of human life and the attitude of Jesus. These 'occasional offices,' as we call them, belong to those hours in life when men's hearts are deeply moved and they are facing the realities of life and death. The touch of the Church upon them at those times ought not to be less human and true than was the touch of Jesus, our Lord. This is not a plea for subjectivism. One may accept fully the Catholic thought that the feelings and edification of the wor-

[3] Exhortations spoil liturgical comeliness, and if they cannot be readily understood by the simple, what on earth is their value?

shipper are of secondary importance in an act of worship. The reaction of acts of worship upon the worshipper has, none the less, to be considered, for only so can we make sure that the worship is truly directed. It is known by its fruits. If they are a superstitious mind, a self-centred heart, or a morality that falls short of the highest men know—the worship is not adequate. If the form is so unintelligible that the worship ceases to be corporate, it is not adequate. The proportion in which subjective and objective elements should enter will vary according to the service and the occasion. The presence of both is a condition of reality in worship.

The House of Clergy also turned a dull ear towards criticisms and amendments put forward on ethical grounds. A member said to me that while the House listened patiently and attentively to those who spoke, it was impatient of and unwilling to consider amendments that raised moral issues—and this was true of the attitude even of that section of the House which ought to have shown the keenest attention to such questions—the Evangelical representatives. (Few things have been more disappointing in the proceedings than the unconstructive, not to say unintelligent, part they have often taken.) The most conspicuous example of a failure to do justly by an important ethical question was the discussion on equality of vows and promises in the Marriage Service, and the ridiculous compromise in which it issued.[4] There seemed to be slight recognition that on this question the minds of most thoughtful women are made up, and that the practical alternative to equality of vows and promises is a large increase in the number of those who prefer to get married in registry offices and come to the Church afterwards for a nuptial blessing.

In fairness to the members of the House, one has to admit that this attitude reflected the mind of those who sent them there. The fact is that, in spite of Copec, few of the clergy or ecclesiastical laity are thinking vigorously on moral questions, or are in touch with those who are. While the process of disentangling the Christian conception of God from pagan conceptions of Providence, and Hebrew conceptions of Yahweh, has gone steadily forward during the last half-century, the parallel

[4] The vows are practically identical, but the woman still promises to obey.

process of elucidating the Christian ethic, which derives from the Christian conception of God, has hardly begun. As things are in the nation, it is more disastrous for the Church to be identified with an ethic that is below the best moral idealism of the day than to be saddled with a theology that may appear rather old-fashioned.

Is it too much to hope that the bishops, with their wider outlook on the nation's life, will be bold to do what the House of Clergy has not been quite bold enough to do, and give the Church alternative services which will meet the needs of many loyal churchmen and of many who would like to be loyal churchmen?

In conclusion, one or two more general observations. Those who discuss Prayer Book revision are often at cross-purposes because they do not first discuss the *raison d'être* of revision. To some, revision is only a matter of verbal, liturgical or theological rectification. By others, it is urged for party reasons— to bring doctrine and practice into closer conformity with sixteenth century Protestantism or seventeenth century Romanism; or for ecclesiastical reasons— to make union more possible with the orthodox churches, or with the less orthodox. But surely the paramount consideration is the evangelical mission of the Church and, that which is bound up with it, the spirit of Christ in the life of its members. We want services which will help, and not hinder, the growth of that life and the effectual fulfilling of that mission. A fact which must never be forgotten in discussions of the Church's domestic life is that ninety per cent. of the population are outside of the Church—and not all the ninety per cent. are pagans and unbelievers.

(i) A cardinal factor in the present situation is the large number of men and women (young people especially) living on the fringe of the Church. Many of them are, spiritually and intellectually, the cream of the nation. They are dissatisfied with the Church largely because services and sermons in most churches do not satisfy their deepest needs and aspirations. They are ready, many of them, to find in Jesus, our Lord, the way, the truth and the life; but, rightly or wrongly, they think that the official Church has lost its way; they believe that it does not care particularly for the truth; and they find its corporate life singularly unattractive. For their own sakes, and for the sake of the Church, these men and women must be brought into its fellow-

ship in the next few years. In the revision of the services these folk 'of the fringe,' their criticisms and aspirations, ought to be kept well in view.

(ii) And then beyond this 'fringe' there is the multitude of 'outsiders'—men and women and little ones whom the Christ is ever seeking and loving, and whom the average churchman neither loves nor seeks nor thinks about. There is no respect in which the religion of the man in the pew differs more completely from the religion of the New Testament than in his careless irresponsibility for the fellow outside. The Elder Brother is in a majority on most Parochial Church Councils. And if a padre does have a concern for the ninety-and-nine without, the sheep within will, as likely as not, resent his concern —unless church finances are down. In spite of enthusiastic services and crusades, few churchmen have a keen vision of the missionary purpose of the Church (and of their local church)—a Church militant and moving. Why? It is partly the fault of the Prayer Book. The Tudor and Carolingian bishops who compiled it hardly thought of the Church as a missionary movement, and consequently this apostolic conception of the Church is not articulated in the Prayer Book as it ought to be.

(iii) It is the hardest thing in the world to get church organisers and reformers to face a fundamental question. In parishes we fall into a routine of services and counting heads of communicants, of getting young fellows into clubs, girls into friendly societies, wives into mothers' unions, elderly gentlemen on to church councils, and so building up 'church life'; but are enthusiastic organisers sure that the life they build up resembles the life Christ wishes men and women to live? Would He be as much at home in our flourishing churches as He was in the home at Bethany, or even in Levi's house? And do church reformers really think that when the clergy have pensions, and patronage is tidied up, and quotas are paid regularly, and the electoral machine works without a hitch, the Church will *de facto* have fuller measure of the Spirit that unites the most antipathetic of God's creatures in an adventure of faith and humanity?

What have these questions to do with Prayer Book revision and the Occasional Offices? Much. For one thing, Baptism,

Marriage, Burial of the Dead are in fact to-day the real missionary services of the Church. The so-called 'mission services' are chiefly attended by the faithful and the slightly lapsed, who like a change from the regular services. But for social reasons the man who is right outside does come to marriages and burials, and sometimes to baptisms, so that in these services the Church has her best opportunity of making plain to him what she believes and stands for. As the services are, we miss the opportunity every time of making ourselves anything but plain.

Moreover, we have to remember that in a Church which has a Prayer Book the mind of the community and the direction of its endeavour are shaped by the forms of its common worship. Their influence is the more potent because it is gradual and imperceptible. It is desirable, therefore, that those forms should be liturgically sound, felicitous in phrase, true in their theology and intelligible to those who use them. It is even more desirable that they should make clear, as clear as the Gospels do, the character and quality of Christian fellowship and life. The Church's worship will honour God most if it kindles and sustains in men that integrity and radiant humanity which is seen in Jesus, our Lord, and is a gift, not of nature, but of the Divine Spirit.

OUR PRESENT NEED OF THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST

By the Right Rev. E. W. Barnes, Sc.D., F.R.S.,
Lord Bishop of Birmingham.

MY theme is the world's need, our need, of Christ. Since the war we have been living through a period of reaction and disillusion. Throughout Europe there continues to be profound world disorder; there is also deep-seated mental and spiritual disquiet. Thirty years ago, when those now middle-aged were young, civilisation seemed stable. There was much religious unrest: it was a natural consequence to the great additions to human knowledge won during the nineteenth century. But everybody expected that steady progress, alike political,

social and moral, would continue. No one dreamt that a great era in human history might be drawing to an end. Yet now men wonder. We remind ourselves, gloomily, that other civilizations in the past have collapsed: they were, as a French writer has said, 'no less beautiful, no less fragile, than our own.' To-day we are forced to recognise that over a great part of Europe culture has decayed. There are ominous signs that in this country barbarised thought has become more common. It is certain that economic ruin in Russia has practically uprooted civilization. In Germany and Austria the educated class has endured terrible privations. Europe is only slowly recovering from malnutrition, famine, disease, despair. We have been within a hair's breadth of the bankruptcy of civilization. And the mental and spiritual upset of the threatened catastrophe is still with us. Loss of faith in the goodness and wisdom of God our Father: recrudescence of superstition: greed of pleasure: we may be unconscious of the origin of these manifestations of spiritual disorder. But they are signs of deep-seated psychological distress of which the war was the cause. The war was produced by and has bred what has well been called the spirit of Anti-Christ. Envy, hatred, jealousy, fear, selfishness—between states and nations and classes and individuals—these led to the calamity from which came our present decadence. Unless we can replace the spirit of which they were born by the Spirit of Christ, there is little hope for the world. Must we give up hope? Is religion powerless? Are our churches, as some social critics suggest, picturesque survivals with no essential significance in human affairs? I personally am quite sure that true religion—the Christian Religion—is neither powerless nor effete. But I am equally sure that the churches must present Christ's teaching in its essential purity, free from the sacerdotalism and obscurantism with which it is too often combined, if they are to win the respect of thoughtful men.

The Christian Faith will hold its own because the ethical principles of Christ are necessary for human welfare, and because those principles cannot be separated from the religious view of the Universe which constitutes His revelation.

Think for a few minutes of the civilization built up during the nineteenth century. This earth had never seen its like be-

fore. All the nations had become inter-dependent. Their trade, commerce, and finance were part of a single whole. Bankers had devised a marvellously intricate and delicate machine which adjusted, throughout practically the whole world, the balance of supply of food and manufactured articles. Under the stimulus of this ingenious adjustment the population of Europe trebled: it became, in fact, dangerously large. Only so long as the machine of world-trade and finance worked smoothly was the situation safe. That was why the world's financial magnates dreaded war; why enthusiasts said that such a disastrous absurdity ought to be impossible. It was obvious that the economic machine was bound to get out of gear when once the spiritual basis upon which it rested was injured. Sometimes men say that finance has no soul. But we know it to be untrue. The success of any kind of intercourse between men depends upon the motives, the spiritual forces, which govern those men. And our economic world-order rested upon trust, co-operation, and good-will. It is because the growth of these motives and ideals has been impaired that the economic basis of our civilization has been so grievously imperilled. We all admit that human life has both sacred and secular aspects. Yet we cannot separate them as sharply as men imagine. Religion and economics, ethics and politics, are closely inter-related. If a man cannot live decently, he cannot be religious; if he can only live in destitution, physical misery will destroy his spiritual faculties. The material and spiritual well-being of humanity depend one on the other. The economic perils through which we have passed were ultimately due to spiritual disease. A true revival cannot come unless it be not only economic, but also religious. Men improve their own status by improving that of their neighbours. They find themselves individually happier when they begin to bear, as in every civilized community men must bear, one another's burdens. Trust, co-operation and good-will—in other words, the spirit of Christian brotherhood—these prove their value as effective agents of social health: and so Christ's teaching justifies itself by the facts of human life.

May I urge, at this point, that all of us should distrust extravagant politico-economic adventures. What is called, in Socialist parlance, Capitalism does produce social injustice. We

admit and deplore the fact. But so far human thought has failed to devise any successful alternative to it. It has been created by a long process of experiment. It is the foundation of modern trade, industry, and finance. It has consequently brought vast populations into existence who may resent its working; but, as the Russian experiment shows, they starve without it. We must, especially at a time of profound unrest like the present, beware of impracticable idealism. Because we dislike many results of our present economic system we should be foolish to destroy it until we have something both better and *workable* to put in its place. He who would risk destroying two-thirds of the population of Europe in the hope of creating in the future a better social order shows the type of thought which has been well described as 'the remorseless logic of the undergraduate.' Capitalism is not, in itself, hostile to the Spirit of Christ: it cannot, in fact, function successfully unless some qualities of His Spirit are present. But the economic machine, as everyone admits, would work more successfully, with fewer jars and jolts, if Christ's influence were more pervasive. When justice is tempered by mercy and bargains are altered through sympathy: when between employers and employed there is a mutual respect and a mutual feeling of helpfulness: when humane motives are strong; when, in fact, the ethics of the Gospel are not wholly forgotten, our social order is most healthy. What we need to attempt to-day is to extend the range of Christian idealism within the economic order which we have inherited. Let us seek to transform that order from within. We certainly cannot get outside it unless we break it to pieces: and that way leads to anarchy.

You may object that the world has drifted towards anarchy and that capitalism was the evil genius of the process. Undoubtedly trade rivalries have been used to intensify international suspicion. Financial groups can and do manipulate public opinion for base ends. But such abuses are rendered possible by the existence of national hatreds and jealousies and fears. They would fail if the leading democracies of the world could learn the wisdom of magnanimity; if they could forgive and forget; if they could resolve in the Spirit of Christ to elicit good-will by showing good-will.

Statesmen are handicapped when the peoples whom they represent are morally inert. In fact, the source of our ills to-day is not an economic device called Capitalism but the Spirit of Anti-Christ.

Can we exorcise this spirit? I confess that I can see no hope of moral progress save in a religious revival which shall fire men with simple and sincere enthusiasm for the teaching of Jesus. It is high time that the Christian Churches in general, and the Church of England in particular, should justify faith in Jesus by showing the world's need of His principles. Of what use are sacramental superstitions and liturgical frivolities in our present distress? Of what use is the religious obscurantism which sets religious prejudice against modern knowledge? We cannot make a new world by presenting men with old clothes. Jesus to-day stands out of the pages of history as a Modern of the Moderns because He had a message for all time, a message of vital importance to our own age. If we preach that message we preach the Christ. If we half-bury it under an elaboration of ritual and ecclesiasticism we leave men free to doubt whether we really believe the Gospel of the Son of Man.

It is natural that the churches should at the present time shun the naked truth. In all churches with the honourable exception of the Society of Friends, there was during the war a marked disposition to ignore such principles of the Gospel as were inconvenient. In silence the churches condoned evil deeds. They did not set their influence steadily and firmly to overcome the passions engendered by the conflict. Their members narrowed, and sometimes their preachers travestied, the teaching of Christ.

The state of Europe to-day shows the truth of Edith Cavell's great and truly Christian saying: 'Patriotism is not enough.' We can go further, and say that the combination of patriotism and purity, often regarded by Christians with especial favour, is not enough. Patriotism is a Christian virtue if it be neither bitter nor exclusive and if it leads men in a desire for national well-being to spread the temper of Christ throughout their motherland. Personal purity is undoubtedly a part of the Christian ideal; but a self-satisfied purity is not infrequently joined to a narrow intolerance such as Jesus never manifested. Remember,

moreover, that Roman paganism produced the Vestal Virgins, in whom religion was centred on national pride and sexual purity. But Christianity is the search for the Kingdom of God. Of that Kingdom, Christ said to the ecclesiastical rulers and religious teachers of His time that 'the publicans and harlots shall go in before you.' The publicans were unpatriotic Jews who collected taxes for the hated conqueror. The harlots may have been little worse, but were certainly no better, than the fashionable *divorcées* of our time. Christ's words are a warning against a tendency—too common in ecclesiastical circles to-day—to narrow the Christian ideal. The Kingdom of Christ needs broad foundations. It rests on justice, forgiveness, mercy, temperance, patient service, hope, faith, and love. These things are the expression of the Spirit of Christ. Do not confound that Spirit with the spirit of ecclesiasticism with which religious people tend to confuse it. The world has no need of any of the combinations of piety, superstition, and formalism which are too often presented as the Christian Faith. Oh! the amazing constructions with which men replace the Spirit of Christ. One group will say, 'We have an infallible book well-nigh two thousand years old, and it does not contain a single mistake in science or history, theory or fact.' Naturally, if they are polite, men say 'Remarkable,' and go on their way. Others come forward: 'We belong to an infallible Church which, during a very chequered existence, has never made a mistake in theology or morality.' Naturally men turn aside and go on their way. Others, again, assure us that the British peoples are the descendants of the lost Ten Tribes, and that all the promises of the Old Testament reveal blessings to be showered upon us, probably in this generation. Naturally men turn aside and go on their way. And others will explain that they have a service of singular value for piety and virtue if held at eight o'clock in the morning, but unthinkable at eight o'clock in the evening. Naturally men turn aside and go on their way. It is all so unlike Jesus—Jesus, Whose religion was so much a part of Himself that He was not afraid to jest: Jesus, Whose mockery of folly and exposure of unreality were so brilliant and quick, and so modern. The citadel of Jewish ecclesiasticism was the Sabbath. It fell before the words, 'The Sabbath was made for man, not

man for the Sabbath.' You know, as the years go by, I am ever more impressed by the greatness of Jesus. During the war some of us tried to draw up prayers which German Christians could also say. None equalled the Lord's Prayer. And, when one is depressed by the perversions of Christianity which abound, one has only to return to Jesus in the synoptic Gospels to feel a real sense of elation. 'Surely this Man was God's Son.' We lack the simplicity of true faith in Christ. Active loyalty to Him, which will result from the disentangling of His message from accretions to it which are not seldon substitutes for it—such is supremely our need to-day.

Often enough men and women ignore the Christian Faith because they do not feel that the churches will lead them to the Kingdom of God. They do not wish to enter societies which seem to shelter moribund superstitions and to exclude the Holy Spirit of Truth. It is natural. None the less, Christianity must be organized. We must form societies to preserve and spread our Lord's message. And we need men and women, young and old, inspired by hope and love to enter the churches and refashion them so that the Spirit of Christ finds within the old walls its dwelling place. Arid theology, impossible pretensions, blindness to new truth, superstitions—these are with us to-day in the churches. They are likely to remain so long as clergy and ministers are not recruited from the best of our young men. But the present decay is not permanent. Already, as I believe, religion among us is beginning to reveal its enduring vitality. The very urgency of our need of the Spirit of Christ will cause its power to burst forth anew. As revival comes, the churches will feel and respond to the quickening breath of the Spirit. Men cannot do without Christ. Something in their very nature makes them search for the Kingdom of God. The devil may seem to rule the world; but, in fact, Christ reigns. The Kingdom of God is here and now among us, within us. 'Ask and ye shall receive: seek and ye shall find: knock and it shall be opened unto you.'

BOOK REVIEWS

MEISTER ECKHART.*

This is a valuable book, being a translation of the works of Eckhart published by Franz Pfeiffer in the year 1857, with certain omissions and additions. The whole work is of great importance for serious students, trained scholars or otherwise, who have at heart the liberal and mystical traditions in Christianity. Nothing could make clearer the links between the mystics and English Modernists than a study of *Meister Eckhart*. A thirteenth century Dominican who held high office in the Order, he was a man of immense reputation in his own day as a spiritual guide. This reputation, combined with his formidable powers as a master of subtle dialectic, just managed to preserve him from excommunication as a heretic until a year or so after his death. A daring and original thinker, yet ill-disposed to rest satisfied merely with the acceptance of orthodox phraseology, he nevertheless believed himself to be a loyal member of the Catholic Church, which enshrined in its faith and worship the spiritual experience of the past. 'A man never gets to the underlying truth,' he himself says, 'if he stops at the enjoyment of its symbol' (186).

In studying such writers as Eckhart, one learns to be thankful even for the allegorical method of interpreting scripture. Notwithstanding its historical weakness, it was the one means whereby spiritual religion was enabled to hold up its head within the Church until the time came for the scientific method as the only basis of a sound exegesis. Hardly ever does Eckhart, in his constant use of the Scriptures, quote texts in their plain and original meaning. 'All the stories and quotations taken from them,' he says, 'have another, esoteric meaning' (257): they are merely vantage points from whence, with a show of orthodoxy, the great philosopher-mystic discourses on the themes of the spiritual world and the soul's ascent to God. The following is an example of his method: 'Do not fondly imagine that God, when He created the heavens and the earth and all creatures, made one thing one day and another the next. Moses describes it thus, it is true; nevertheless he knew better: he did so merely on account of those who are incapable of understanding or conceiving otherwise' (7). After this disarming preliminary, he goes on to interpret the matter to his own liking. In another place he writes—and it is instructive: 'In what I am about to say I intend to avail myself of natural proofs that ye yourselves can grasp, for though I put more faith in the Scriptures than in myself, nevertheless it is easier and better for you to learn by means of arguments that can be verified' (4). But when his argument is working up to a startling conclusion he stops short and exclaims: 'I do but teach you the Scripture' (157), or protests that he is but following St. Augustine. With this great authority behind him he is not afraid to quote: 'All scripture is vain' (69), and at least twice we find him throwing to the winds the wisdom of the children of this generation and rising to prophetic heights: 'It is written in the Book of Moses . . . but I say . . .'; 'According to the Scriptures . . . but I declare . . .' (196 *f*).

* *Meister Eckhart*. By Franz Pfeiffer. Translated by C. de B. Evans. (John M. Watkins, London, 1924. 483 pp. 20/-.)

Neither is Eckhart afraid to spiritualise the dogmas of the Creeds. The angel Gabriel at the Annunciation 'was speaking not alone to God's mother, but to a goodly multitude, to every virtuous soul desiring God. . . Had Mary not borne God in ghostly fashion first, He never had been born of her in flesh. . . It is more worth to God His being brought forth spiritually in the individual virgin, or good soul, than that He was born of Mary bodily' (221).

The familiar moral and intellectual difficulties concerning heaven and hell come in for frequent treatment. 'Theologians speak of hell. I will tell you what hell is. It is merely a state. Your state here is your eternal state' (317, 330). And he goes on to make it clear that he means a state of mind. Or again, what burns in hell is not any fire soever (49): 'hell torment really means the frequent lapsing of the soul from the purpose of God's effort, which is, to bring the soul to life again' (199). Better still, we have in the Twelfth Tractate an energetic repudiation of the doctrine of rewards and punishments and an appeal to the higher and not the lower instincts of mankind. 'It is true spiritual perfection to love God for His own sake, regardless of hell and heaven.' 'Though there be neither hell nor heaven, yet will I love God; Thee, Father, and Thy sublime nature' (368 *f*).

In a discussion on the last things with his spiritual daughter, Sister Katrie (p. 331 *ff.*), she says, in Eckhart's own vein: 'Touching the last day, people say God shall judge. So He shall, but not as they think. Each man is his own judge in this sense: the state he then appears in he is in externally. People frequently assert: The body shall rise with the soul. So it shall, but not as they think. The being of the body and the being of the soul shall go to form one being.' The point is that the body does not really rise, that there is 'no life of the body when we go hence.' Eckhart himself makes a philosophical distinction between the body and the *being* of the body, the latter being absorbed into the being of the soul when all things have perished (285). Katrie goes on to speak of the Translation of the Virgin and others 'of whom report says they are body and soul in God. . . . It is not possible. In God can be nothing but God, not mouth, nor nose, nor hand, nor foot, nor any created thing belonging to the body. . . .' '. . .'Tis well argued,' replied the Master with becoming detachment on such an occasion, 'but you must know the question is in hot dispute among the theologians.'

We must pass over the discussion on the Ascension (93, 331), the future life (26, etc.), the wrath of God (34, etc.), to Eckhart's ideas on the Incarnation and the Atonement, which are thoroughly Greek. 'Even if Adam had not fallen, yet would Christ have been made man' (407). Not only so, but the Incarnation is a process which is still in operation: God brings His son to birth in the soul whenever she will, and this is the Atonement (46): in other words, the Incarnation *is* the Atonement. Also an extension of the Incarnation is to be found in the Sacrament. Moreover, 'I make bold to say, were anyone prepared for outward food as for the Sacrament he would receive God as much as in the Sacrament: which is to many people a hard saying, albeit quite consistent with the truth.' Equally hard is another saying in the same (the eighteenth) Tractate: 'By living the Christ life more than my own I am Christ rather than James or John, and so this befall *beyond time* (italics mine) I am changed into God' (407).

This last statement is one of many which intoxicated and overbalanced less powerful minds than that of Eckhart himself. On one occasion Sister Katrie came to him crying 'Sir, rejoice with me. I am God' (325). The excesses of his spiritual daughter seemed to have carried away even Eck-

hart himself on another occasion, for it is recorded that after much conversation with her in this strain he was ravished and 'took leave of his outer senses so that they had to carry him into a neighbouring cell, where he lay for long ere coming to himself again' (333). However, the incident seems to have been unique, and Eckhart confesses elsewhere to a lack of these abnormal visitations, adding that the matter does not trouble him—perhaps because he knew that the pure experience of God in this life which it is claimed they bestow is a delusion. He is content to believe in the *existence* of such pure experience (325)—but only *beyond time* (407). After careful consideration of many passages concerning the flight of the soul to the spiritual world, we have come to the conclusion that the considered judgment of the Master was that when the soul is perfectly recollected it transcends itself and becomes spirit, but that spirit is not turned into God unless it is joined to Him *perfectly* (187). Such a perfect union, however, is not possible in this life. 'It is of the very essence of the soul that she is powerless to plumb the depths of the Creator: there is left in the soul a little point where the soul turns back upon itself and finds itself and knows itself to be a creature' (282). In order to obtain this self-knowledge and at the same time the knowledge of God, knowledge being the foundation of all being and antecedent to love (63), the soul has been given various powers, of which the chief are intellect and will: these powers are dependent upon the body (207) so that the life of this world is the indispensable condition of training the soul to see God (298). Here we have, then, the Pauline psychology of body, soul, and spirit. Eckhart's whole philosophy is a passionate attempt to bring the soul to a true knowledge of itself and the God in Whom alone it may find rest. 'Her face is lit with passion,' he says, speaking of the 'rage' or impetuosity of the awakened soul, 'because she is not all God is by nature' (389), and the beautiful prayer is wrung from him, 'Grant that I by Thy Grace may be united to Thy Nature, as Thy Son is eternally one in Thy Nature, and that Grace may become my nature.' This is the theme of all his prayers: to pray for aught save God is not to pray at all (129): it is idolatry and unrighteousness (27).

It seems to us, therefore, that Eckhart may be acquitted of the worst errors of pantheism, though we cannot forbear to quote passages in the Hegelian vein. 'God loves my soul so much that His very life and being depend upon His loving me. . . . To stop God loving me would be to rob Him of His Godhead' (26); 'His divinity consists in the communication of Himself to whatever is receptive of His goodness, and did He not communicate Himself He would not be God' (178 *b*); 'Before creatures were, God was not God: *He was that He was*' (meaning presumably the Absolute) (218). It is evident therefore that Eckhart would not have us believe that God is in process of 'becoming' in His creatures: 'all things plus God amount to nothing more than God alone' (165): but that he only intends to emphasize that there is a community of nature between God and man. Like can only communicate itself to like. We return, then, to the main subject of Eckhart's system, the soul and its relation to the spiritual world.

Exactly what is the point of actual contact between the two it is difficult to judge from the bewildering mass of Eckhart's discourses on the theme, for they contain many contradictions; and since there is no clear evidence concerning the dates of his different writings, no development in his thought can be traced. Sometimes it lies in the ground of the soul itself, above the powers of the soul, a kind of immanent impersonal prin-

ciple into which the soul may gather up itself and retire. Sometimes, however, this point of contact, or 'spark,' is regarded not as something higher than, or resulting from an union of, the faculties, but as one of the two highest faculties of the soul themselves—either the active intellect (or higher reason which includes intuition) or the will, each of which is higher than the mere understanding or discursive reason.

The point which we here desire to emphasize is that Eckhart was setting aside the great system of Thomas Aquinas which identifies faith and reason and places God at the end of a syllogism. Duns Scotus escaped from the coils of the Angelic Doctor by reducing the scholastic method to absurdity and making faith dependent on an act of will. Eckhart, however, like all the great mystics, subordinates, though he does not oppose, logic to intuition: 'faith inheres in intellectual light' (78): it is indeed for him 'reason grown courageous': 'only whither the soul is unable to go with her senses and powers can faith take her' (135), so that religion in its essence is no longer a creed but an adventure and an experience. A religious philosophy of this type touches human personality at every point and is always modern.

Religious communions like the English Church, in which the Platonic tradition is strong, owe more to Eckhart than is generally recognised. He was the master of all the great European mystics of the fourteenth century, who re-echo him continually. Moreover, he tried to bring religion home to the common people. Thus the Reformation owes him a two-fold debt of gratitude.

As in the case of all rational mystics, his teaching abounds in homely and telling illustrations and advice of a practical and sensible nature. Concerning these, however, we must be brief. 'A man should not dragoon himself' (141): the bridle of love is to be preferred over penitential practices (24 *f*). Visions and locutions are often 'tricks of the soul, indulging in comfortable intuitions of divinity and answering herself by a sort of reflex action' (447). 'Some people think to see God with their eyes as they would see a cow, and they expect to love Him as they would love a cow—for its milk and cheese' (52). Prayers in this strain are an evil and *deprive* us of God; instead we should aim high and master God (133) for 'no man ever wanted anything so much as God wants to make the soul aware of Him.' However hard it may be at first to part from and die to all created things, 'having once got into it, no life is more easy, more delightful, or more lovely' (173).

Finally we would quote one sentence which, for its sturdiness as well as its sentiment, should endear the Master to all religious minds in which the modern outlook is deeply rooted. 'Truth is a most noble thing. If God were to backslide from Truth, I would fain cling to Truth and let God go' (42).

R. D. Richardson.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL LIFE.*

The significance of the four volumes here noticed together is undoubted. Everywhere men are studying afresh the social implications of Christianity, and seeking in the teaching and spirit of the Man of Nazareth some remedy

* *Christian Social Duty*, by John Lee. S.C.M. 1925. Price 5/-. Pp. 176. *Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society*, by H. A. Mess. S.C.M. 1923. Price 6/-. Pp. 248. *The Message of C.O.P.E.C.*, by H. A. Mess. S.C.M. 1924. Price 1/6. Pp. 110. *Christ and Labour*, by C. F. Andrews. S.C.M. 1924. Price 4/- and 2/6. Pp. 182.

for the evils of modern life, some programme of constructive reform, some spiritual dynamic whereby the vast mass of rather backbone-less good intentions may be transformed into intelligent and effective action.

All three writers are experts possessed of a first-hand knowledge of the problems with which they deal; all alike maintain that in 'applied Christianity' will be found the solution of which we are in search; all, too, while not afraid of plain speaking, have learned to conduct controversy with unruffled tempers. But there the resemblances end. And the very differences of view-point and of subject-matter render the more impressive the large measure of agreement which their writings display.

Mr. John Lee is an Anglo-Catholic and the managing head of a great Government Department. Mr. H. A. Mess, a Free Churchman and a Pacifist, who will be known to many as a member of more than one of the Copec Commissions, is to be warmly congratulated on the success of his courageous attempt to boil down the bulky Copec Reports into a little volume of not much more than a hundred pages, a volume which those who have so far refrained from tackling the Reports themselves will do well to study forthwith. Mr. C. F. Andrews, the traveller of varied experience, the table-companion of men whose grand-parents were head-hunters and cannibals, writes with an intimate knowledge of Labour conditions in India, Africa and the Pacific, and with a force and vitality which it would be difficult to surpass.

Mr. Lee's volume, *Christian Social Duty,* is a plea for what he calls 'consecrated individualism.' He lives in fear of the State and of State action, on the ground that such action tends to 'lower the levels of honour.' He has little good to say of legislation, and towards Socialism he is definitely unfair, branding it as 'a creed which despairs of human nature,' asserting of projects of State ownership that they are 'born in unfaith,' and comparing modern schemes of legislative reform with the paternal despotism of the Roman Empire. Legislative action is said to 'take the place of a Christian sensitiveness to wrong,' the dangers of virtual compulsion towards righteousness are emphasised, and mention is made of 'the subtle temptation to postpone our social righteousness until the day when some social regime for which we are striving has been established, by which our social righteousness will be done for us.'

Here a good case is vitiated by unbalanced presentation. Obviously legislation has its dangers, obviously compulsory righteousness is a sub-Christian ideal. But the alternative is not, as Mr. Lee suggests with rather wearisome reiteration, a choice between soulless legislation and consecrated individualism. Surely legislation may be the expression of personal righteousness rather than its substitute. And to suggest that the enthusiast for social reform will prove an advocate of postponed social righteousness is, we submit, a very sorry gibe indeed. Nor on the face of it is there any valid reason why a man should not be inspired by the ideal of doing his duty to the State. And indeed Mr. Lee himself does something to atone for the one-sided presentation of his case by a reference to 'the admitted spiritual dangers in personal philanthropy,' and by acknowledgement of the temptation which may beset the enthusiast for the conversion of the individual, 'to put away the sense of economic responsibility for the more convenient season.' In stressing the importance of the spiritual factor Mr. Lee has done good service. We can only regret that the argument is frequently weakened by over-emphasis.

As a Copec enthusiast, it might be expected that Mr. Mess would underrate the importance of the individual. But we do not find that he has in

fact done so. His book, *Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society,* lays equal stress on the need for the changed heart and the transformed environment. His demand is for a Christian outlook, and he says much that is valuable upon the nature and effects of that outlook if and when obtained. Mr. Mess never yields to the temptation of offering easy solutions of intricate problems; nevertheless he insists relentlessly that the standards of Christ must be applied to every department of human life. 'The answers to economic questions,' he writes, 'must be given by economists, just as the answers to questions of chemistry must be given by chemists. But questions of chemistry may be, and economic questions usually are, bound up with questions of human relationships, which are ethical questions,' and therefore questions with which Christianity is intimately concerned.

Our author is right, too, in insisting that Christianity is 'a way of life for communities as well as for individuals,' and that 'there is a constant give and take between the morality of the individual and the morality of the community.' If to-day the collective practice of the Christian virtues appears extraordinarily difficult, it is because the world 'has been unified politically and economically far more rapidly than morally or spiritually.'

Like Dr. Henson and the Dean of St. Paul's, Mr. Mess deplores 'the pathetic fallacy that the transformation of society must or can precede the regeneration of its members.' But his outlook is truer than theirs in that he recognises no less clearly the danger of under-estimating the influence of the material upon the spiritual. 'It is a false other-worldliness,' he tells us, 'which refuses to consider carefully bread-and-butter problems.' The spiritually-minded realise the dignity of bread and butter; of it are built the temples in which the Holy Spirit is willing to dwell.'

If Mr. Mess has no love for the capitalist system, he is able to put the case on its behalf as clearly and impartially as the case against it. 'It is claimed by its apologists that the system overcomes laziness, that it teaches self-confidence and enterprise, and that it has led men to co-operate on the large scale; it is asserted by its opponents that it stimulates greed and jealousy, and that it encourages a few to domineer whilst it deprives the many of opportunities of exercising initiative.'

Much is truly said of that sorely needed virtue, 'corporate humility.' Mr. Mess urges the necessity of forgiveness on an international scale, asserting with blunt honesty what is too often forgotten or ignored, that 'a proposal to benefit our nation without regard to the harm which may be done to other nations is an unchristian proposal.' Himself a convinced Pacifist, he offers his argument 'in charity and humility, with a realisation that the majority of Christians think otherwise.' While not advocating the elimination of all force, Mr. Mess pleads that 'Christianity is absolutely incompatible with war, in which a measured and considerate use of force is an absurdity,' and that war is 'a method of coercion unsuitable for the purposes of love.'

Space does not allow a fuller notice of this important volume. The book deserves a second and third reading, and is an admirable example of the right method of approach to social and international questions in their relation to the Christian faith.

If Mr. Andrews does not succeed in making his readers uncomfortable, their skins must be thick indeed. In *Christ and Labour* he surveys for the most part the same problems as Mr. Mess; but his field is wider, the sources of his information more varied, and his style more dramatic. The book opens with an able survey of social conditions in the Roman and Mediaeval world, followed by chapters on the Reformation and the Indus-

trial Revolution. From this survey the author derives a certain measure of hope, but his optimism is tempered by a clear recognition of sinister possibilities. 'In the next fifty years,' he writes, 'it is not at all impossible that the very worst results of industrial capitalism in Europe will be visible in India on a vastly extended scale.'

The exposure of trade conditions in India and elsewhere is at once sober, well informed, and withal terribly scathing. What is said of the jute trade or of the profits of the Indian millowners makes shameful reading. More than once the appeal is made for fair play between communities, as when those Australian Christians 'who demand that they shall not be economically disturbed themselves' are asked whether 'they are prepared to cease from economically disturbing by their own different standard of living the countries of Asia.' Nor is there any denial of the assertion that 'the Indian Government is still to-day enriching itself with the profits of an opium monopoly which has been proved up to the hilt to be used for the express purpose of debauching human lives.'

'Economic exploitation outside Europe,' says Mr. Andrews, is 'the central factor in the labour problem, and it exists throughout the world.' The European races have become, as it were, 'the feudal lords of the greater part of the rest of the world,' and as Englishmen we need to be ever on our guard against 'the cant of self-congratulation and self-praise.' For despite loud professions of virtue, 'whole nations have committed brigandage and have gloried in it; whole nations have grown luxurious out of the misery of other lands.'

Mr. Andrews has written a courageous, challenging and stimulating book, which we hope may be as widely read as it deserves.

W. M. Pryke.

INDIAN PROBLEMS.*

No problem among the many that claim a place in the thought of the statesmen and students of the last few years demands more insistently a solution than that of Nationalism. And of all the countries in which a solution is urgently needed, none is more important or more interesting than India. For here not only nationalism but also racial factors affect the situation. The course of the struggle in India and in those parts of Africa where there is an Indian population is of vital importance to the future of racial relationships. No book could, therefore, be more welcome than one which can display to Western readers, themselves unfamiliar with the situation in India, the factors which have to be considered and the difficulties which have to be surmounted in approaching a solution of the problem which confronts the British in India to-day. Such a book Dr. Whitehead, formerly Bishop of Madras, has given us. Well qualified to speak by his long residence in the country, and by the positions which he has held, he possesses also the virtues of clearness in his arrangement and sympathy and insight in his treatment of the questions with which he deals. The prejudice of conservative British views and the wild optimism of much Indian speech and writing are alike absent from his pages, and the admirable historical introductions in which he deals with the origins and elements of each particular issue enable the reader to see for himself the

* *Indian Problems in Religion, Education, Politics.* By Bishop Whitehead, D.D. Constable, London. 336 pp. 12/-.

justice of the Bishop's solution. This is particularly valuable when he is dealing with such controversial themes as the Indian position in Kenya or the Amritsar tragedy.

The book opens with a review of the religious situation and an estimate of the success and failure of the different religions in India; for, as the preface says, 'religion has been the chief preoccupation of India from the earliest ages in its history and has had a dominant influence in determining the special character of Indian civilisation. The political situation in India is constantly discussed in England as though it had no connection with religion; but in India you may expel religion with a pitchfork, but it will always recur.'

The good and bad points in Brahman and Buddhist, Hindu and Muhammadan, are reveiwed in turn. Little, however, is said of the reformed non-Christian creeds in modern India. That they have not penetrated into the mass of the people is true, as is the Bishop's verdict that 'In the matter of moral reform Hinduism is paralysed by the fact that neither the many deities of the multitude nor the Supreme Being of the philosophers are necessarily moral.' Yet in view of the frequent reference made to these reformed groups by Indians in this country in their opposition to Christian work in India, and of their claims that these rather than Christianity provide the religion most necessary for the Indian mind, a fuller survey of them would have been a valuable contribution to these chapters. It is one of the few occasions where judgment is delivered without the facts being presented, and it is the more regrettable in that it is in its religious outlook that the book is naturally open to criticism by non-Christian readers. Ram Mohun Roy, for example, appears only to be condemned as an advocate of English education. His work with Lord William Bentinck in suppressing the burning of widows and the founding of the Brahma Samaj are omitted. But for many the most interesting chapter will be that of Church Unity, for as the Bishop says: 'In England we speak of the reunion of the churches. In India the most appropriate term is Christian unity.' It is 'to create a unity which has never existed' out of a disunity which is 'a foreign importation, alien . . . to the desires and interests of Indian Christians.' The imperative need for unity in the new churches of the East is perhaps the most hopeful factor making for the reunion of the Christian West. 'The difference between the Church at home and the Church in India, Africa or China is very much the difference between an army on a peace footing, engaged largely in ceremonial parades, and an army on a campaign. The Church of England is mainly occupied in worship, and the subject that at the present moment awakens its interests, and I must add its passions, is the revision of the Prayer Book: while the Church of England in the mission field is compelled to realise that its main business is to conquer the world for its Master. It is natural, therefore, that the question of a united front should present itself as an imperative necessity in India, whereas in England it is looked upon as a matter of doubtful expediency.

The experiment already made in South India and the National Council in China are, it is to be hoped, only the beginnings of a wider and more comprehensive movement in the East which ultimately cannot fail to react for good on the churches in Europe and America also.

The second section of the book (Part III) deals with the problem of education. Here the British have attempted a task almost unique in the history of the world—to educate a people with a great civilisation of their own and a pronounced national genius for philosophy and religion in a

language and in subjects both alike foreign. No more mistaken step could have been made than that undertaken on the recommendation of Lord Macauley to form 'a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect.' The result, as is clearly shewn, has been inevitable failure. The use of a foreign language as a medium for higher education has meant that half of the students have not been sufficiently familiar with the words to follow the thoughts of the lecturer; and in other schools it has meant a wholesale return to illiteracy, which makes the money spent, inadequate though it be, largely useless. That English should be universally taught in the higher schools is desired by most Indians themselves. It opens to them most that is good in Western civilisation and is the common language of the East—indeed the only common language of India itself. But Indian character and Indian thought must be built up on the basis of the language of the Indian home. Here the missionaries have led the way. The Bible is translated into the vernaculars and the village schools teach in them. In his chapter on village education the Bishop is speaking from a very wide experience and his endorsement of the report of the commission of the Missionary Societies that village schools should be 'community centres with community teachers' offers to English workers and Indians alike the kind of life which is best calculated to bring out all that is good in a man. No one could complain of narrowness in his vocation if he is to be the kind of village schoolmaster the Commission and the Bishop desire. '"A centre is needed for the circulating library. The teacher may become the initial secretary of the co-operative society. School inspectors, missionaries, and villagers revisiting their homes could be occasionally secured to give lectures. The teachers may be used to distribute seed sent out by Government. . . . The village women may come for an hour a week to learn sewing, and incidentally receive instruction in hygiene and sanitation." I would add to this that the School might well be used as a simple dispensary and for spreading information as to the treatment of most prevalent diseases.' Such schoolmasters would be in touch with the real village life and could adapt their teaching to its needs instead of regarding the school, as the Government now does, as a preliminary for higher education, although at least eighty per cent. of the children will spend their lives in the village and never go near the towns or universities.

The last section of the book deals with Politics, and here the method adopted of giving a historical introduction is particularly valuable. If we say less of this section it is not because there is less to say, but because ultimately the deciding factors in the situation are Religion and Education, and it is on these that the book breaks fresh ground for English readers. But the Bishop also speaks as a statesman, neither purely British nor Indian, but with a sense of the unity of mankind, east and west. The modern political movements in India, the National Congress, Gandhi, the results of the Amritsar and Kenya crises are presented extremely fairly and offer a most valuable corrective to those whose ideas are based on the Press or popular views. The final problem, however, is the goal of India. All thinking men will accept the Bishop's verdict that the time has not yet come for Great Britain to withdraw from India, nor for the ultimate control of policy to pass from Westminster to Delhi. So far so good; but the arguments used for advocating the permanent place of India in the British Commonwealth are distinctly weaker. Separation need not mean enmity, and the arguments of trade and capital are really without weight. We have money invested in Argentine, Brazil or China, without wanting them

to be in the British Commonwealth. The time has not yet come for a decision, nor are the factors on which that decision will be made yet in existence. But it is certain that remaining within the Empire or hostile withdrawal are not the only alternatives, and if India ultimately passes out of the Empire altogether that is not in itself any great proof of the failure of mankind to solve the race problem than the passing out of Egypt need be. Norway and Sweden separated and are not enemies, nor when the time comes need India and Great Britain be. This, however, still lies in the future and not in our generation.

J.W.P.

IF A MAN DIE?

The value of Dr. McNeile's latest volume, *The Problem of the Future Life*, will be found less in any novelty of speculation than in the clarity and moderation with which the various factors of the problem are presented for consideration. 'Our views on the condition of the departed cannot,' he tells us, 'be based on the "infallible authority" of this and that passage of Scripture,' and from the nature of the case human language can offer no more than a symbolic and imperfect expression of spiritual intuitions.

The fact of survival is accepted without detailed argument. Neither the doctrinaire denials of the materialist, nor the vague idealism which prates of a world-soul or a mere immortality of values, can satisfy the demands of the Christian consciousness. 'Immortality means the persistence not simply of the Ego, but of the Ego as affected by and conscious of its past—a real continuance of the whole personality.' In the last resort our conviction of survival must be based upon a belief in the rationality of the universe, upon a faith in the value to God of the individual soul, and upon an adequate conception of divine justice.

Dr. McNeile writes helpfully upon the subject of the supposed 'new revelation' of Spiritualism, summing up his argument as follows:—'Spiritualism as a proof of life after death is *unnecessary;* as a source of higher knowledge of the life with God it is *unsatisfying;* as the real explanation of the phenomena it is *uncertain;* and for mediums and enquirers alike it is *unsafe.*'

The discussion on the significance of 'Eternal Life' is valuable. As might be expected, Dr. McNeile follows the fourth Evangelist in the interpretation which he offers us of the meaning of the expression. And the same is true of our author's conception of judgment. Judgment and punishment alike are to be regarded as present processes. And the apocalyptic conception of a Day of Judgment is frankly discarded, with the result apparently that we are free to think with Dr. Glazebrook of a resurrection-body 'ready to clothe the soul in the hour of death'—a supposition which Bishop Chase would no doubt vehemently deny. The whole discussion is temperate, frank and illuminating, so that when, at the conclusion of the chapter, we are solemnly assured that 'if it had been intended that we should draw from Scripture a clear-cut picture of the future existence of those who are being saved, the Holy Spirit would no doubt have guided the writers to be more explicit,' we are conscious almost with a shock that the Regius Professor of Divinity has left the lecture-room for the pulpit, having hastily slipped a surplice over his university gown.

* *The Problem of the Future Life*, by A. H. McNeile, D.D. W. Heffer & Sons, 1925. Price 3s. 6d. Pp. 155.

The discussion of Probation and Progress brings us once more back to the lecture-room. 'Every step of progress or of retrogression in the spiritual life' must be thought of as a 'degree of nearer movement' to heaven or hell. 'So that "going to heaven" and "going to hell" is in each case a spiritual process, not a spatial movement, still less a spatial movement performed only after the death of the body.' This is admirably expressed, and the whole treatment of the question is based throughout not upon texts, but upon sanctified common sense which, when all is said, can alone guide us towards any reasonable solution of the problems of the after-life.

The discussion of the meaning of Resurrection is less happy. True, the 'physical resuscitation of corpses' is frankly abandoned, the conjectures of Spiritualism are rightly branded as inadequate, and the dangers resulting from popular hymns strongly insisted on. But Dr. McNeile's apparently wholesale acceptance of the details of the resurrection stories in the Gospels leads him to more than one doubtful contention. We are assured, for example, that 'the reason why He (Jesus) does not appear to all Christians in the same way must be that in the first days it (*sic*) was needed for evidential purposes.' Again, while the Empty Tomb is accepted, we are told that 'there is no warrant whatever for believing that Resurrection means the coming up out of the grave of the actual buried physical body.' For all that, alike in our Lord's case and in ours, Dr. McNeile would persuade us of the strict propriety of the word 'resurrection,' since 'when the body dies something springs into vital spiritual activity out of the body.' Here is speculation, possibly legitimate speculation. But when we are told further that this survival of 'something,' this springing into vital spiritual activity of the soul's new instrument of expression, is what the Creed means by the resurrection of the flesh, we can only enter an indignant and emphatic protest. To say that 'many people cannot recite the clause in the Creed as it stands because they think it means what it does not mean' is surely to assert something misleading in the last degree.

The concluding section of the book deals with 'those who are being lost.' Theories of endless punishment, annihilation, universalism, are temperately discussed, and Dr. McNeile is prudent enough to refrain from a partisan allegiance to any one solution of the problem of the unrepentant. The difficulties of each view are frankly faced, and the position is summed up on the last page in a series of '*Ifs*,' which, while they leave the question an open one, present the reader with a clear statement of rival possibilities.

One is left with the impression that in Dr. McNeile's mind there is a sharp though, it may be, imperfectly realised struggle between the claims of tradition and common sense, between static Orthodoxy and progressive Liberalism, between the scholar and the priest. Where Orthodoxy prevails, it is at least an Orthodoxy largely emancipated from mere traditionalism. Where Liberalism is prominent, it is still a Liberalism not yet wholly freed from the shackles of imposed belief.

W. M. PRYKE.